



INDIANA
DEPARTMENT OF
CHILD
SERVICES

*Protecting our children,
families and future*

Demographic Trends Report

State Fiscal Year 2004

(July 2003 to June 2004)

2004



State of Indiana



Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr., Governor
James W. Payne, Director

Indiana Department of Child Services
Room W392 - MS03
402 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2739

317-232-4705
FAX: 317-232-4490

www.in.gov/dcs

Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline: 800-800-5556

Dear Fellow Hoosier:

Thank you for reviewing the 2004 Annual Demographic Trends Report for the Department of Child Services. As we form our new department and undergo transforming child services into a system of excellence, we will continue to look at ways we can better serve children and families.

The data in this report is for fiscal year 2004. Under the previous administration, FSSA's Division of Family and Children was responsible for the data seen in this report. As a new agency we are issuing this report to provide relevant information to those interested.

The next five years will show many changes in how we do business in order to provide children with safe, nurturing, and stable homes:

- Better training will be made available to DCS staff
- New family case manager qualifications will be implemented
- More staff will be hired to help us reach the recommended caseload of 12 and 17
- DCS will manage by statistics
- Regionalization will be implemented and help provide better service to families and children

Thank you for your interest in the well being of children.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "James W. Payne".

James W. Payne
Director



Protecting our children, families and future



Department of Child Services

Table of Contents

• Department of Child Services Overview	1 – 3
• Institutional Child Protection Services	3
• Child Fatalities	3 – 4
• Indiana Kids First Trust Fund	4
• Indiana Foster Care Program	4
• Title IV-E Foster Care Program	4 – 5
• IV-E Waiver Program	5
• IV-E Reimbursement	5
• Adoption	5 – 6
• Special Needs Adoption Program	6 – 7
• Indiana Adoption History Program	7
• Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children	7
• Residential Licensing Sections	7 – 8
• Assisted Guardianships	8
• Chafee Foster Care Independent Living Program	8
• Contract and Grants	8
• Healthy Families	9 – 10
• Policy Changes Effecting the Data Collection Methods	10 – 11
• Indiana Child Welfare Information System (ICWIS)	11 – 12
• Department of Child Services Charts and Program Data	13 – 48
• Bureau of Child Support Overview	49 – 52
• Indiana Support Enforcement Tracking System (ISETS)	52 – 53
• Child Support Charts and Program Data	54 – 62





Department of Child Services

The Department of Child Services (DCS) local offices serve children in the state who are at risk of abuse and/or neglect and children and their families where abuse and/or neglect has been substantiated. DCS administers programs that provide family services, child abuse prevention services, foster care, adoption, independent living, residential licensing, residential investigations, and other youth services.

The Family Preservation Program provides services to prevent out-of-home placement or to reunify children and their families in cases of substantiated reports of child abuse or neglect. Program services offered to families include but are not limited to education, counseling, visitation, sexual abuse treatment, parent aides, homemaker services, and home-based family services.

The program carries out these goals by providing four (4) basic services: Service Referral Agreements, Informal Adjustments, Services to a Child in Need of Services (CHINS) and Reunification Services.

- **Service Referral Agreements** – voluntary agreements made by the family case manager, parent(s) and other involved parties when a family admits to a problem, the child is not at serious risk in the home, and no court involvement is sought.
- **Informal Adjustments** – agreements made by the family case manager, the child's parent(s) guardian, custodian, attorney and other involved parties when a family admits to a problem and the child is at minimal risk in the home. The agreement is filed with the juvenile court, must be approved by the court, and may include many of the above-noted services.
- **Services to a Child in Need of Services (CHINS)** – services to children who are victims of child abuse and neglect include case planning, periodic case review and many of the services mentioned above. Services are also provided for the child's family. CHINS cases are directed and monitored by the juvenile court.
- **Reunification Services** – services provided to families when a child who has been removed from the family has a goal to return to the family. Any or all of the above-noted services may be offered. The objective is to reunify children and their families in cases of substantiated reports of child abuse or neglect. However, the safety of the child remains the priority in the decision to reunify.

The State of Indiana has developed a five- (5) year plan for child welfare services with the help of community partners. The five- (5) year plan is funded by several funding streams including Title IVB Part II monies. The 5 year plan can be located at <http://www.in.gov/fssa/families/protection/2004-2009statecw5yearplan.doc>.

The Family Preservation Program provides services to prevent out-of-home placement or to reunify children and their families in cases of substantiated reports of child abuse or neglect. Program services offered to families include but are not limited to education, counseling, visitation, sexual abuse treatment, parent aides, homemaker services, and home-based family services.

Family preservation expenditures largely reflect the cost of home and community-based services to children and their families who are under the supervision of the local office of family and children, and have been placed in their own homes. However, some of these costs are spent on home and community-based services to families of children who have not yet been returned home. The





Department of Child Services

purpose of these services is to prepare the family for the safe return of the child.

Child Welfare expenditures include Foster Care (IV-E), Adoption Assistance, Child Welfare Assistance, Non-Recurring Adoption Expense and Independent Living. Child Welfare expenditures have steadily increased over the last 10 years going from 187 million in 1994 to 345.1 million in 2003.

SFY 2004 Child Welfare Expenditures

Foster Care (IV-E)	41.7
Adoption Assistance	42.5
Child Welfare Assistance	275.4
Non-Recurring Adoption Expense	1.1
<u>Independent Living</u>	<u>1.6</u>
TOTAL	362.3

Child Protection Services (CPS) operates a toll-free hotline (1-800-800-5556) for people to call and report suspected cases of child abuse or neglect on a statewide basis. The 1-800 number connects to the local DCS office where the telephone call originates. Although reports can be made in person or by correspondence, the vast majority of child abuse and neglect reports are made by telephone. CPS receives and initiates investigations of abuse reports on a 24-hour basis. Reports that are made via third parties or from people who may not have first knowledge of the conditions or incident must still be evaluated upon the same merits as other reports. Anonymous reports are accepted.

Investigations of abuse and/or neglect may be substantiated, unsubstantiated or indicated. The child's safety is the primary factor in all CPS investigations. Families receive services based on an assessment of the child's and the family's needs, and an assessment of the relative safety and risk to the child in the home.

In Indiana, abuse and/or neglect occurs when a child who has not yet attained the age of 18 experiences a condition in which:

1. the child's physical or mental health is seriously impaired or seriously endangered as a result of the inability, refusal or neglect of the child's parent, guardian, or custodian to supply the child with necessary food, clothing, shelter, medical care, education, or supervision (IC 31-34-1-1).
2. the child's physical or mental health is seriously endangered due to injury by the act or omission of the child's parent, guardian, or custodian (IC 31-34-1-2). This section would address inappropriate discipline and an allegation that the illegal manufacture of a drug or controlled substance is occurring on property where a child resides.
3. the child is a victim of one or more of the following sexual offenses (IC 31-34-1-3); Rape (IC 35-42-4-1), Criminal Deviate Conduct (IC 35-42-4-2), Child Molesting (IC 35-42-4-3), Child Exploitation/Child Pornography (IC 35-42-4-4), Child Seduction (IC 35-42-4-7), Sexual Misconduct with a Minor (IC 35-42-4-9), Public Indecency/Indecent Exposure (IC 35-45-4-1), Prostitution (IC 35-45-4-2), or Incest (IC 35-46-1-3).
4. the child's parent, guardian or custodian allows the child to participate in the performance of sexual activity as defined by IC 35-49-2-2 (Matter if Performance Harmful to Minors) or IC 35-49-3-2 (Obscene Performance).





Department of Child Services

5. the child's parent, guardian, or custodian allows the child to commit indecent acts or prostitution prohibited by IC 35-45-4.

Children in Need of Services, as defined in IC 31-34-1-6 through 31-34-1-8, are not considered to constitute abuse or neglect but are included as they may result in intervention with the family and child. These categories are:

IC 31-34-1-6 Child substantially endangering own or another's health

IC 31-34-1-7 Parent, guardian, or custodian failing to participate in school disciplinary proceeding

IC 31-34-1-8 Missing child.

IC 31-34-1-9 (Disabled child deprived of necessary nutrition or medical or surgical intervention) specifies that all the CHINS categories include a child with a disability who is deprived of necessary nutrition or medical or surgical intervention generally provided for similarly situated children with or without disabilities.

IC 31-34-1-10 and IC 31-34-1-11 are part of the definition of a child in need of services based on child abuse/neglect as defined in IC 31-9-2-133 concerning a victim of child abuse or neglect.

IC 31-34-1-10 defines a child is a victim of abuse or neglect if the child was born with fetal alcohol syndrome or any amount of a controlled substance or legend drug in the child's body.

IC 31-34-1-11 defines a child as a victim of child abuse or neglect if the child has an injury or any abnormal physical or psychological development or has a substantial risk of a life threatening condition that results from the mother's use of alcohol, controlled substance, or legend drug while pregnant with the child.

Acts and circumstances that are suspected of falling within these parameters of child abuse and/or neglect are subject to the mandatory reporting requirements.

Institutional Child Protection Services

Child Protection Services **includes** investigating allegations of child abuse and/or neglect in any institutional or out-of-home care setting. Reports are received at the local office, and investigations of abuse are initiated within 24 hours. This program determines whether the child should remain at the facility or home, whether adequate protection can be provided, whether referrals are needed for follow-up monitoring, and whether referral for prosecution of perpetrators is warranted (substantiated cases).

Facilities could include Child Care Center (licensed and unlicensed/exempt), Child Care Home, Foster Family Home, Group Home, Registered Child Care Ministry, Residential Facility, School, State Institution, Hospital, Other. Perpetrators could include facility staff and other residents.

Child Fatalities

A child fatality review process has been in place since SFY 1999 to improve information gathering and prevention strategies in the area of child fatalities due to abuse and neglect. All counties have fatality reviews by policy as an extension of community child protection teams or via a legislatively approved team (IC 12-13-15). An internal state team reviews detailed information regarding each death involving substantiated abuse and neglect and shares aggregated information with community partners to develop prevention strategies. The annual Child Fatality Report is located at <http://www.in.gov/fssa/statistics/pdf/2005-02-08childfatalityreport.pdf>

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Department of Child Services





Department of Child Services

Child Fatalities for State Fiscal Year 2004

Fatalities due to Abuse	Fatalities due to Neglect	Total Fatalities
22	35	57

Abuse and Neglect SFY 2004 Annual Report

Indiana Kid's First Trust Fund

In a prevention effort, the Indiana Kid's First Trust Fund collects revenues from the "Kids First" license plate and distributes the funds through grants to agencies dedicated to preventing child abuse and neglect.

The goal of the Indiana Kid's First Trust Fund is to provide primary and secondary prevention services to Indiana's children to help ensure that they are not abused or neglected. The Kid's First Trust Fund grant recipients work to provide practical solutions that teach good parenting skills, including the importance of nutrition, how to be an active parent and how to discipline without spanking the child. Other programs provide children with encouragement that helps them grow up healthy and break the intergenerational chain of abuse and neglect.

The Kid's First Trust Fund sends contributions from Kids First license plate sales directly to local community programs that prevent the tragedy of child abuse and neglect. Income for the Kid's First Trust Fund comes from "Kids First" plate sales, fee collections (marriage & divorce filing fees), heirloom birth certificate sales, cash donations and interest. For additional information about the Kid's First Trust Fund, please visit the website at <http://www.in.gov/fssa/children/grant.html>

Indiana's Foster Care Program

Indiana's Foster Care Program provides 24-hour care to children who can no longer safely remain in their homes due to the occurrence or risk of abuse or neglect, or due to their own need for care and treatment for behaviors which constitute a danger to themselves or others.

Children may be placed in an approved relative home, a licensed foster family home, a group home or child-caring institution, or other court-approved facility.

State policy is to place children in the least restrictive, most family-like setting which meets the child's needs. When possible, a child is placed in close proximity to the child's family, particularly when reunification with the family is the case plan goal.

Foster parents and other care providers work to help reunite a child with a biological parent, or care for a child until that child is adopted. Foster parents and child care professionals are involved in case planning and provision of services to the child and the child's family utilizing a team approach with the child's case manager. Local office staff ensure that foster parents receive proper notification concerning case activities of children in their care.

Title IV-E Foster Care Program

The Title IV-E Foster Care Program provides federal funds for foster care or residential care per diem payments for children whose families would have been eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) using the 1996 standards.

By claiming federal IV-E reimbursement local offices can maximize the financial resources available to serve children and families in their communities. Eligible services include maintenance payments

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Department of Child Services





Department of Child Services

such as food, clothing, shelter, daily supervision, school supplies and liability insurance.

IV-E Waiver Program

In July 1997, the federal Department of Health and Human Services approved Indiana's application for a Child Welfare Demonstration Project, also known as the IV-E Waiver Project. The waiver redesigns the current federal reimbursement system for funding children's services. It emphasizes a more aggressive development of a family focused, community based service delivery system for children in care. The goal of the waiver is to stimulate the growth of community based children's services, thereby shifting significant costs from out-of-home care to services to children and families in their own homes. Each child in the project must have a plan for services approved by the local judge with juvenile jurisdiction.

Indiana was the seventh state to have been approved for the IV-E Waiver Project and the only one whose waiver program is statewide. Indiana's project was the largest in scope and involved the use of foster care funds in a more flexible approach to meet the needs of children and their families. Interagency agreements for the waiver are in place in each of the 92 counties between the local judge, probation officers and the local office Director. The waiver applies to 4000 children at any given time and does not require that the children be removed from the homes in order to access federal funds.

IV-E Reimbursement

The claiming of federal IV-E reimbursement is a high priority for the Department. By claiming effectively, local offices can maximize the financial resources available to serve children and families in their local communities. Reimbursement claims are possible in a case when there is a combination of an eligible child, an eligible facility and eligible costs.

For a child to be eligible, he or she must be under age 18 and must meet 1996 AFDC eligibility requirements at the time of removal. In addition, there must be a judicial finding in the child's case that it was contrary to the child's welfare to remain at home and that the state provided services to prevent the child's removal from home, or that reasonable efforts to return the child home were not required. Reimbursement claims are possible in a case when there is a combination of an eligible child, an eligible facility and eligible costs.

A facility is eligible if it houses no more than twenty-five children. In addition, the facility must be licensed by the state, and must not be primarily for detention purposes. Eligible services include maintenance payments such as food, clothing, shelter, daily supervision, school supplies and liability insurance.

Adoption Program

Indiana's Adoption Program serves children who are legally available for adoptive placement and who need a permanent family. The State Adoption Program includes recruitment activities and services to the prospective adoptive family, as well as financial support and services to the family receiving the child.

The objective of Indiana's Adoption Program is to find permanence with a family for all Indiana children who are legally available for adoption.

Many of the children in the state system are considered special needs children – children over two years of age, member of a sibling group, or with a mental, physical and/or emotional challenge – who can be more difficult to place. To accommodate the needs of these children, the Special Needs





Department of Child Services

Adoption Program (SNAP) was implemented in 1990 to recruit and support adoptive families for this special population.

Special Needs Adoption Program

The Special Needs Adoption Program (SNAP) implemented in 1990 recruits adoptive families and facilitates the adoptive placement of children with special needs.

The adoption program works in partnership to recruit minority adoptive families, facilitate the adoptive placement of children with special needs and provide the community at large an educational service regarding the needs of adoptive children. Special needs children are usually age 2 or older. Many are of minority background, members of a sibling group that need to be placed together and/or have been diagnosed with developmental, psychological or medical/physical challenges. It is rare that a child involved with DCS for adoption does not have some type of special need.

The Special Needs Adoption Program employs regional adoption casework specialists to recruit adoptive families as well as work with children and families in order to facilitate the adoptive placement of children who have special needs.

Indiana's adoption initiatives have resulted in an increase of finalized adoptions from 464 in 1996 (prior to state funding launching these initiatives) to 1152 in 2000, 956 in 2003, and 1054 in State Fiscal Year 2004.

All DCS Children (including SNAP) Finalized Adoptions State Fiscal Years 1999 – 2004

1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
962	1,152	1,178	1,055	956	1054

Figures are based on a **State Fiscal Year** (July – June) for 1999-2004

This data does **NOT** include private adoptions.

Source: ICWIS

Financial assistance programs available for families who adopt eligible special needs children include:

- **Non-Recurring Adoption Expenses Program** – provides funds to reimburse the adoptive parent for one-time expenses incurred in legally adopting a special needs child.
- **Federal Adoption Assistance Program** – provides financial assistance to families who adopt IV-E eligible children via per diem payments. The child is eligible for Medicaid.
- **County Adoption Subsidy Program** – provides financial assistance to families who adopt children with special needs and demonstrate to the court that per diem and/or medical assistance is needed in order to meet the adopted child's needs.
- **Indiana Adoption Subsidy Program** – provides medical assistance to families who adopt children who have county subsidy maintenance or health subsidy and an existing medical condition.

For more information about Indiana's Adoption Program, visit the website at

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Department of Child Services





Department of Child Services

<http://www.in.gov/fssa/adoption/>.

Indiana Adoption History Program

The Indiana Adoption History Program was established as a result of enabling legislation passed in 1993. The purpose of this program is to assist persons seeking information regarding adoptive situations to which they were a party. The Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH) is responsible for administering the program, but the county offices play a major role in assisting persons to obtain information not available through ISDH. Parties to an adoption may obtain non-identifying information from the county offices without a court order if it is available. However, no identifying information may be released by a county office without obtaining permission from ISDH to do so, since certain signatures must be on file before identifying information can be released.

Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children

The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children is designed to protect the interests and safety of all children in state custody who are being placed in out-of-home care or for private adoption across state lines and national boundaries. This compact provides a mechanism for the approval of the placement of children into relative, foster, or adoptive homes or into residential facilities and for on-going monitoring of the children's progress in these out-of-state placements.

Residential Licensing Sections

The Residential Licensing Sections of the Bureau have licensing authority for a number of facilities and homes. The primary purpose of licensing of foster family homes is to minimize the risk to children in out-of-home care by monitoring and enforcing compliance to minimum health, safety, and program standards as established in 470 IAC 3-1.

Local Offices and licensed child-placing agencies have the responsibility and the authority to assess compliance with these standards and to submit licensing recommendations to the Bureau of Family Protection and Preservation.

Also, the section collaborates with the State Fire Marshal's Office, the State Department of Health, and the office of the State Building Commissioner. These cooperative efforts ensure that minimal standards of fire and building safety and public health protection are maintained for children in child (day) care centers and homes.

The Section also issues licenses to residential child care institutions and group homes. Child caring institutions are agencies which provide 24-hour residential care for dependent, neglected, abused, delinquent, or troubled children who are unattended by a parent, guardian, or custodian. The minimum standards for child institutions servicing 11 or more children are found in 470 IAC 3-11 and 470 IAC 3-12. The minimum standards for group homes (agencies serving ten or fewer children) are found in 470 IAC 3-14 and 470 IAC 3-15. The Bureau also has authority to license private secure facilities. The minimum standards for private secure facilities are found in IAC 470 3-13.

The Department of Child Services in conjunction with state fire inspectors monitors and reviews compliance to these standards at least annually in an effort to maximize the health, safety, and well-being of children placed in these residential treatment programs.

Department staff additionally issues licenses to child-placing agencies. Child-placing agencies are authorized to recruit foster parents and to make foster family home licensing recommendation to the DCS, to complete adoptive home studies, and to place children in either foster homes or adoptive homes. Some child-placing agencies provide only foster care services while others provide both foster care and adoptive services including therapeutic foster care and international adoptions.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Department of Child Services





Department of Child Services

Assisted Guardianships

Assisted Guardianship is a possible permanency option for children under the supervision of the Department of Child Services, and is considered when an older child is placed with relatives who promote a permanent, long-term living arrangement that is in the best interest of the child.

This option is available after a court has determined that reunification with the child's parents is no longer feasible, and that adoption is not in the best interest of the child. Both the child and the relatives must meet specific eligibility requirements, and the program calls for a monthly subsidy to be provided based on the need of the child as defined by Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) guidelines.

Chafee Foster Care Independence Program

Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) provides the state with funding to purchase direct services for youth (ages 14-21) living in foster care who have aged out of foster care. The funding is to be used to help the youth transition to self-sufficiency. Services that can be purchased through this program include: education, training and related services; services to prepare for and obtain employment; services to prepare for and enter post secondary training and educational institutions; services to provide personal and emotional support to youth through mentors and the promotion of interactions with dedicated adults. Room and Board types of expenses can be offered to former foster youth (ages 18-21) who were in care on their 18th birthday.

Contracts and Grants

Contracts and Grants are administered through the DCS, and responsibilities for the ten funding sources are contracted out to private agencies throughout the state for the provision of direct services. The federal funding sources are:

- Chafee
- IVB I & II
- Social Services Block Grant
- Community Based Family Resource and Support Grant

The state funding sources are:

- Project Safe Place
- Youth Service Bureau Fund
- Kid's First Trust Fund (license plate sales and other donations)

These funds are allocated on a competitive basis to agencies providing services in these categories:

- Family Planning, Youth Services, Child Abuse Prevention, Families and Children Services and Independent Living Services

Healthy Families

Over nine years ago the Family and Social Services Administration launched the Healthy Families Indiana home visiting program with a vision of supporting and educating new parents, beginning at or before their baby's birth. The program has grown into a statewide voluntary home visiting initiative with the following three goals: to promote positive parenting, to encourage child health and development, and to prevent child abuse and neglect. By working closely with hospital maternity wards, prenatal clinics, and other local agencies, Healthy Families systematically identifies families that could benefit from these education and support services either before or immediately after birth.







Department of Child Services

The growth of the Healthy Families Program throughout Indiana has been unprecedented. Currently, 56 Healthy Families Indiana sites are providing services to families and children in all 92 counties. Prevent Child Abuse America and Healthy Families America credentialed Healthy Families Indiana as a statewide, multi-site system on June 9, 2004. For a detailed listing of the sites by county please refer to: <http://www.in.gov/fssa/families/protection/hfisites.html>. Prevent Child Abuse America Healthy Families America (HFA) designates Healthy Families Indiana as the HFA Midwest Regional Resource Center of Excellence. Indiana is widely recognized as a national model for the Healthy Families America initiative because of the extensive training services. In order to maintain support of Healthy Families rapid expansion, multi-level leadership from the public/private sector is critical to the program. Current partnerships include but are not limited to: First Steps Early Intervention, Women, Infants and Children (WIC), Early Head Start, Head Start, Office of Family and Children, Division of Mental Health, Juvenile Justice Institute, and Hospitals.

The expansion of Healthy Families demonstrates how the program has grown in program funding and families served since its inception in 1994.



Funding is a combination of local, state and federal dollars.





Department of Child Services

The number of families served has increased from 760 in 1994 to 23,554 in 2003

For additional information about the Healthy Families Indiana Program, please visit their website @ <http://www.in.gov/fssa/families/protection/dfchealthy.html>

Policy Changes Effecting the Data Collection Methods

Here is a list identifying some of the changes in the data collected over time. This will be helpful when viewing data for trend analysis. It may help explain some variances in the data from year to year and facilitate interpretation of the data. Understanding what the data is actually reflecting about program activity is crucial for program development and policy making.

- During 1995 and 1996 the ICWIS was designed and developed by Unisys Corporation.
- In March 1997 the system was implemented in all 92 counties. Each county works from an independent data system. Each night data from all 92 counties is downloaded to a centralized data system in Indianapolis. The reason for the independent nature of the counties data systems is to assure confidentiality of clients.
- Prior to 1996, abuse/neglect reporting was based on a hierarchy of abuse with sexual being the most severe followed by physical and last by neglect. That meant if a child suffered multiple types of abuse/neglect, only the single most severe type was reported. Due to a change in the federal reporting requirement in 1999, ICWIS was required to report all incidences of abuse/neglect so one child could potentially have multiple reports of abuse/neglect. Therefore, comparisons of data before and after 1999 are not feasible.
- There are two types of duplications possible in abuse/ neglect data. One is where the report of abuse/neglect can indicate more than one type of abuse/neglect, i.e. sexual abuse, physical abuse or some combination with neglect where the child is counted once for each type of abuse/neglect in the report. The other is where there is more than one report of abuse/neglect for a child in the year and the child is counted for each report, but only counted once under one category of abuse/neglect for each report.
- The counties during 1997-1999 did manual reporting as they transitioned into ICWIS. In 2000, an influx of transitional information was entered into the data reporting system. A policy directive mandated all child welfare workers to enter all their cases into ICWIS. This involved a massive effort of entering cases opened in previous years but not entered. So old cases, intakes and investigations from 1997-1999 were entered into the system and reflected in 2001 data resulting in higher numbers reported for 2000-01.
- The indicated category was included in the abuse/neglect reporting from 1993 – 1995. Indicated is used when child abuse and/or neglect reports were made and there was not enough evidence to substantiate or unsubstantiated the report but there was a reason to suspect the child may have been maltreated or was at risk for abuse and/or neglect. Indicated was included in the reporting of substantiated abuse cases from 1993 – 1995. The status indicated was discontinued in 1995. The inclusion of indicated cases with substantiated cases from 1993 –1995 appears to have resulted in higher numbers of abuse being reported compared to subsequent years.
- Per HEA 1194-2003, effective 7-1-04 indicated status was again being reported.





Department of Child Services

- Abuse/Neglect data on unsubstantiated investigations from 1997 – 2000 was expunged after six months and aggregate numbers were not retained for these investigations for the years 1997 - 2000. This practice resulted in lower numbers being reported for unsubstantiated investigations for this period of time. Since 2000, aggregate data for unsubstantiated investigations has been collected and reported.
- ICWIS utilizes a point in time reporting format. Report is a snapshot of what is known on the last day of the month. Over the course of the year the user makes updates and modifications to the data so if pulled again it reflects differently. A point in time average for a specified period of time can be calculated using the count of children at the end of each month divided by the number of months specified.
- Data within ICWIS is dynamic which means data changes day by day according to new data entries from the field. Thus reports from ICWIS have the potential for showing different data from the same report if pulled after an update to the Central Database or individual counties databases.
- Adoption data in ICWIS for 1990-2001 was based on numbers self reported by local offices for all children in DCS custody who were adopted. Since this adoption reporting was done manually, the reliability of the data can not be verified. ICWIS data does NOT include private adoptions. In 2002, a policy decision was made to discontinue use of manual reporting for adoptions, and rely solely on data entered into ICWIS for adoption counts.
- Prior to 10/15/04, institutional investigations were counted in Central Office. Beginning 10/15/03, institutional investigations are counted in the county in which they occur.

Indiana Child Welfare Information System (ICWIS)

Project Description

During 1995 and 1996, the Indiana Child Welfare Information System (ICWIS) was designed and developed. This system provides Indiana with child protection services, intake capabilities as well as case management and administrative management capabilities. This statewide system allows the child welfare staff in local offices of the Department of Child Services to record all calls, whether for voluntary services or to take a report of a suspected case of child abuse or neglect. The system performs historical searches to identify prior involvement in child abuse or neglect, identifies types of service needed and potential service providers for those services. It records the relationships and roles of the individuals, records the types of abuse or neglect, and recommends to the local worker the time frames for response and the type of response to meet the situation. Contained within the system are risk, needs, strength, assessment tools, and a central statewide client index.

The technology provides a vehicle to record the processes and procedures used by both local and central office child welfare staff. This system promotes consistency of policy across the state in assessing risk for abused/neglected children, as well as matching resources to family needs more effectively. The system also provides strong security for the information it collects. Indiana has very specific confidentiality requirements and the system enforces those requirements. This helps to prevent inappropriate sharing of abuse and neglect information.

Reporting

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Department of Child Services





Department of Child Services

ICWIS provides data collection for Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) and National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) reporting. ICWIS also provides statistical support for identification of services, as well as information that provides the opportunity to plan and target funding toward the development or needed services. ICWIS utilizes a point in time reporting format for the majority of the reports, however, real time data reports can also be generated. A point in time report is a snapshot of what is known on the last day of the month. Over the course of the year the user makes updates and modifications to the data so if pulled again for the same period of time it reflects differently.

History

In the mid-1990s, the federal government began requiring that all states implement an electronic method for their Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting Systems (AFCARS). Along with that requirement came federal funding, with the government reimbursing 75 percent of the costs to implement such a system. During 1995 and 1996, the ICWIS was designed and developed by UNISYS Corporation. The system was implemented in all 92 counties by March 1997. Each county works from own independent data system. Each night all 92 counties are downloaded to a centralized data system in Indianapolis to assure confidentiality of clients.

Technical Description


ICWIS is a three-tiered client/server application. An Ethernet LAN links client workstations to county servers. Each county server is connected to the primary server in Indianapolis over a high-speed frame relay network. E-mail and bulletin board capabilities are available to all 1400 users. The system is an Oracle database using PowerBuilder screens on an IBM server using Microsoft NT or higher.

Contracts

Unisys Corporation provides application maintenance, modifications, and enhancement services for ICWIS. Invoice is based on usage as defined in the contract.



Child Welfare Expenditures State Fiscal Years 1994 - 2004



Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
FSSA Reports and Statistics





Number of CHINS per Thousand of Population by County on June 30, 2004

County	Estimated Population July 2003	CHINS Children June 2004	CHINS Per Thousand
Adams	33,592	42	1.3
Allen	340,153	865	2.5
Bartholomew	72,341	97	1.3
Benton	9,189	11	1.2
Blackford	13,876	13	0.9
Boone	49,370	25	0.5
Brown	15,313	11	0.7
Carroll	20,499	12	0.6
Cass	40,415	36	0.9
Clark	99,482	233	2.3
Clay	26,772	17	0.6
Clinton	33,947	85	2.5
Crawford	11,146	57	5.1
Daviess	30,047	50	1.7
Dearborn	47,849	49	1.0
Decatur	24,747	20	0.8
DeKalb	41,129	79	1.9
Delaware	117,488	442	3.8
DuBois	40,200	33	0.8
Elkhart	188,779	273	1.4
Fayette	24,999	68	2.7
Floyd	71,148	26	0.4
Fountain	17,750	23	1.3
Franklin	22,773	17	0.7
Fulton	20,508	28	1.4
Gibson	32,991	80	2.4
Grant	71,572	129	1.8
Greene	33,244	70	2.1
Hamilton	216,826	21	0.1
Hancock	59,446	33	0.6
Harrison	35,706	64	1.8
Hendricks	118,850	22	0.2
Henry	47,699	96	2.0
Howard	84,880	65	0.8
Huntington	38,143	24	0.6
Jackson	41,639	88	2.1
Jasper	31,078	29	0.9
Jay	21,732	7	0.3
Jefferson	32,250	54	1.7
Jennings	28,111	89	3.2
Johnson	123,256	71	0.6
Knox	38,745	76	2.0
Kosciusko	75,301	65	0.9
LaGrange	36,026	55	1.5
Lake	487,476	1662	3.4
Laporte	109,878	159	1.4

County	Estimated Population July 2003	CHINS Children June 2004	CHINS Per Thousand
Lawrence	46,201	71	1.5
Madison	131,121	209	1.6
Marion	863,251	2710	3.1
Marshall	46,352	97	2.1
Martin	10,347	7	0.7
Miami	36,177	44	1.2
Monroe	122,903	216	1.8
Montgomery	37,911	39	1.0
Morgan	68,656	34	0.5
Newton	14,403	24	1.7
Noble	47,039	44	0.9
Ohio	5,732	7	1.2
Orange	19,616	6	0.3
Owen	22,827	15	0.7
Parke	17,329	6	0.3
Perry	18,717	45	2.4
Pike	12,931	38	2.9
Porter	152,533	225	1.5
Posey	26,876	16	0.6
Pulaski	13,835	12	0.9
Putnam	36,692	47	1.3
Randolph	26,833	34	1.3
Ripley	27,316	70	2.6
Rush	18,016	29	1.6
Saint Joseph	266,348	613	2.3
Scott	23,556	51	2.2
Shelby	43,717	66	1.5
Spencer	20,343	3	0.1
Starke	23,139	45	1.9
Steuben	33,706	60	1.8
Sullivan	21,861	54	2.5
Switzerland	9,435	8	0.8
Tippecanoe	154,848	199	1.3
Tipton	16,422	3	0.2
Union	7,238	39	5.4
Vanderburgh	171,889	382	2.2
Vermillion	16,572	3	0.2
Vigo	104,540	279	2.7
Wabash	34,339	43	1.3
Warren	8,703	4	0.5
Warrick	54,744	59	1.1
Washington	27,618	7	0.3
Wayne	70,235	60	0.9
Wells	27,912	25	0.9
White	24,852	10	0.4
Whitley	31,651	14	0.4
Statewide	6,195,643	11,643	1.9

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Year End Reports
-Report 117

www.census.gov/popest/datasets.html
-co-est2003-alldata.csv
Page 14



State of Indiana
Mitchell E. Daniels Jr., Governor - James W. Payne, Director
402 West Washington Street, Room W392 / Indianapolis, IN 46204-2739



CHINS JD/JS Statistical Report by County For June 2004

County Name	TITLE IV-E Foster Care		Placements of CHINS							Placements of JD/JS						
	CHINS Children	JD/JS	Total CHINS	Foster Homes	Residential Care	Adoptive Homes	Own Home	Relative Home	Other	Total JD/JS	Foster Homes	Residential Care	Adoptive Homes	Own Home	Relative Home	Other
Adams	6	0	42	17	8	0	15	2	0	24	0	5	0	19	0	0
Allen	241	6	865	373	76	0	246	83	87	104	5	75	0	10	0	14
Bartholomew	32	2	97	45	18	0	24	6	4	90	1	17	0	72	0	0
Benton	5	0	11	6	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blackford	1	1	13	7	4	0	2	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	0	0
Boone	4	0	25	6	5	0	13	0	1	42	0	12	0	30	0	0
Brown	2	1	11	5	3	0	3	0	0	5	1	2	0	2	0	0
Carroll	3	0	12	7	2	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Cass	10	3	36	20	4	0	9	2	1	27	3	19	0	3	1	1
Clark	43	0	233	128	43	0	48	7	7	16	0	0	0	16	0	0
Clay	13	0	17	15	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Clinton	22	1	85	31	14	0	20	17	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Crawford	11	0	57	16	19	0	8	7	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Daviess	18	1	50	27	5	0	6	10	2	6	0	3	0	3	0	0
Dearborn	16	1	49	27	5	0	15	2	0	17	1	13	0	3	0	0
Decatur	6	0	20	9	4	0	2	2	3	3	0	2	0	1	0	0
DeKalb	16	2	79	46	12	0	14	0	7	19	3	8	0	7	0	1
Delaware	80	10	442	96	64	0	194	82	6	98	0	34	0	59	0	5
DuBois	14	2	33	21	7	0	3	2	0	10	0	5	0	5	0	0
Elkhart	77	4	273	167	46	0	37	13	10	59	8	32	0	18	0	1
Fayette	21	8	68	23	5	0	31	9	0	54	7	16	0	26	1	4
Floyd	7	0	26	9	4	0	7	4	2	16	0	1	0	14	0	1
Fountain	5	1	23	6	10	0	6	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Franklin	4	0	17	6	4	0	6	0	1	7	0	0	0	7	0	0
Fulton	6	0	28	14	4	0	5	5	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
Gibson	23	0	80	34	2	0	30	11	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grant	20	0	129	48	5	0	40	27	9	9	0	6	0	3	0	0
Greene	14	0	70	37	7	0	15	1	10	11	4	6	0	1	0	0
Hamilton	3	0	21	10	3	0	3	4	1	22	1	16	0	4	0	1
Hancock	4	0	33	13	7	0	9	3	1	8	0	5	0	0	0	3
Harrison	12	0	64	18	21	0	14	11	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0
Hendricks	2	0	22	6	3	0	6	0	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Henry	30	9	96	45	17	0	20	9	5	90	8	24	0	56	0	2
Howard	26	9	65	36	3	0	14	12	0	21	3	16	0	1	0	1
Huntington	5	1	24	11	2	0	10	1	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	1
Jackson	12	0	88	35	4	0	34	5	10	13	0	11	0	2	0	0
Jasper	13	0	29	13	7	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jay	1	0	7	1	3	0	3	0	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0
Jefferson	12	1	54	25	13	0	14	0	2	15	6	8	0	1	0	0
Jennings	9	0	89	13	15	0	49	8	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Johnson	0	0	71	28	7	0	11	13	12	11	0	0	0	11	0	0
Knox	24	0	76	21	8	0	14	21	12	22	1	5	0	16	0	0
Kosciusko	10	0	65	31	4	0	12	15	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
LaGrange	5	0	55	13	8	0	22	10	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Lake	467	0	1662	574	388	0	448	178	74	76	0	16	0	58	0	2
Laporte	32	3	159	58	6	0	67	19	9	117	0	16	0	99	0	2
Lawrence	17	1	71	37	2	0	18	9	5	11	1	8	0	2	0	0
Madison	50	14	209	64	32	0	76	20	17	68	3	51	0	9	0	5

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Year End Reports
-Report 117





CHINS JD/JS Statistical Report by County For June 2004

County Name	TITLE IV-E Foster Care		Placements of CHINS							Placements of JD/JS						
	CHINS Children	JD/JS	Total CHINS	Foster Homes	Residential Care	Adoptive Homes	Own Home	Relative Home	Other	Total JD/JS	Foster Homes	Residential Care	Adoptive Homes	Own Home	Relative Home	Other
Marion	579	4	2710	1117	201	0	467	788	137	226	5	97	0	94	1	29
Marshall	30	0	97	58	9	0	23	3	4	21	1	3	0	11	0	6
Martin	3	1	7	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
Miami	7	0	44	21	5	0	13	2	3	32	4	9	0	18	0	1
Monroe	82	0	216	135	15	0	31	27	8	17	0	0	0	17	0	0
Montgomery	5	0	39	11	3	0	10	12	3	6	2	1	0	3	0	0
Morgan	8	2	34	18	1	0	14	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	1
Newton	3	0	24	10	4	0	9	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Noble	7	0	44	25	7	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	0	0	7	1	2	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Orange	2	0	6	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Owen	3	0	15	7	0	0	7	1	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0
Parke	2	0	6	3	1	0	0	2	0	15	0	3	0	11	0	1
Perry	11	0	45	14	6	0	9	13	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pike	10	0	38	23	1	0	7	2	5	14	2	2	0	10	0	0
Porter	29	0	225	80	8	0	100	32	5	8	0	5	0	3	0	0
Posey	2	0	16	2	2	0	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pulaski	3	0	12	3	4	0	5	0	0	11	2	4	0	5	0	0
Putnam	9	1	47	23	10	0	6	1	7	8	1	5	0	2	0	0
Randolph	7	1	34	21	4	0	8	0	1	24	5	16	0	3	0	0
Ripley	15	0	70	35	13	0	13	6	3	5	2	0	0	3	0	0
Rush	9	0	29	12	2	0	11	1	3	4	1	2	0	1	0	0
Saint Joseph	126	8	613	340	101	0	112	40	20	133	7	90	0	9	0	27
Scott	18	2	51	24	0	0	18	9	0	5	3	2	0	0	0	0
Shelby	12	1	66	16	6	0	25	18	1	15	4	8	0	3	0	0
Spencer	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
Starke	9	0	45	20	12	0	9	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steuben	6	0	60	18	6	0	16	9	11	8	1	2	0	5	0	0
Sullivan	20	1	54	30	5	0	8	5	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	4	1	8	4	1	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Tippecanoe	61	3	199	100	22	0	46	16	15	28	1	19	0	8	0	0
Tipton	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	1	0	0
Union	3	0	39	7	9	0	14	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Vanderburgh	101	3	382	129	31	0	130	52	40	41	0	28	0	13	0	0
Vermillion	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vigo	74	2	279	134	19	0	103	11	12	18	2	11	0	5	0	0
Wabash	13	1	43	31	2	0	10	0	0	18	6	11	0	1	0	0
Warren	3	0	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warrick	5	0	59	29	10	0	13	1	6	19	0	2	0	16	0	1
Washington	3	4	7	6	0	0	1	0	0	35	0	9	0	25	0	1
Wayne	23	2	60	38	5	0	10	5	2	14	0	3	0	11	0	0
Wells	5	0	25	9	4	0	11	0	1	6	3	1	0	2	0	0
White	4	0	10	2	5	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Whitley	1	0	14	4	2	0	6	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
June 2004	2774	118	11643	4870	1474	0	2950	1703	646	1886	114	800	0	857	3	112

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Year End Reports
-Report 117



Case Activity for Children in Substitute Care For the Period July 2003 to June 2004

Children in Care at the Beginning of Period	Children Entering Care During Period	Children Leaving Care During Period	Children in Care at the End of Period
10,320	7,698	6,891	11,176

Number of Children Leaving Care by Reason, Ethnicity, and Race

Reason for Leaving	American Indian / Alaskan		Asian		Black		White		Multi-Racial		Native Hawaiian Pacific		Unavailable		Total
	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	
Reunification	0	0	0	1	1	238	28	309	6	21	0	1	0	0	605
Adoption	0	2	0	0	0	60	14	99	0	13	0	0	0	0	188
Relative Placement	19	2	0	10	4	566	99	1,802	10	79	0	1	5	7	2,604
Guardianship	0	0	0	0	0	48	7	135	1	4	0	0	0	0	195
Independent Living	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	19
Other	25	5	0	6	9	969	116	2,015	16	97	0	4	9	9	3,280
Total	44	9	0	17	14	1,886	264	4,372	33	216	0	6	14	16	6,891

Other could be transferred to other agency, emancipation, run away, etc.

Number of Children in Care on June 30, 2004 by Type of Placement, Ethnicity, and Race

Type of Substitute Care Placement	American Indian / Alaskan		Asian		Black		White		Multi-Racial		Native Hawaiian Pacific		Unavailable		Total
	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	H	N-H	
Relative Home	6	2	0	0	3	389	30	613	12	47	0	0	0	2	1,104
Foster Home	62	15	0	7	26	1,655	161	3,003	31	226	0	1	10	17	5,214
Institution	14	2	2	2	12	459	45	1,136	8	37	0	2	1	18	1,738
Group Home	3	1	0	1	1	92	14	312	0	9	0	0	0	11	444
Hospital/Nursing Home	0	0	0	0	1	29	4	58	1	3	0	1	1	0	98
Guardian	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	1,199	0	6	0	0	0	0	1,224
Other	5	1	0	0	0	496	34	732	3	76	0	0	2	5	1,354
Total	90	21	2	10	43	3,124	303	7,053	55	404	0	4	14	53	11,176

Note: H= Hispanic and N-H= Non Hispanic


Note: The Federal definition of race is used with Hispanic separated as an ethnic origin for all races.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Year End Reports
-Reports 118a and 118b



Total Number of Children Reported As Victims of Abuse and/or Neglect State Fiscal Years 1993 to 2004



From February 1997 through 2000 aggregate numbers were not kept for unsubstantiated investigations.

Institutional Investigations have been included since 1999.

A child is counted in only one category per investigation using the old Federal hierarchy of Sexual Abuse, Physical Abuse, then Neglect.

Abuse numbers include Physical Abuse and Sexual Abuse.


From 1993 to 1995 totals include "Indicated".

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 125



Number of Children Reported as Victims of Abuse State Fiscal Years 1993 to 2004



From February 1997 through 2000 aggregate numbers were not kept for unsubstantiated investigations.

Institutional Investigations have been included since 1999.

A child is counted in only one category per investigation using the old Federal hierarchy of Sexual Abuse, Physical Abuse, then Neglect.

Abuse numbers include Physical Abuse and Sexual Abuse.


Indicated was discontinued in 1995.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 125



Number of Children Reported as Victims of Neglect State Fiscal Years 1993 to 2004



From February 1997 through 2000 aggregate numbers were not kept for unsubstantiated investigations.

Institutional Investigations have been included since 1999.

A child is counted in only one category per investigation using the old Federal hierarchy of Sexual Abuse, Physical Abuse, then Neglect.

Indicated was discontinued in 1995.


Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 125





Number of Child Victims of Sexual Abuse (Substantiated Investigations) State Fiscal Years 1993 to 2004



Numbers for 1993 through 1995 include Indicated Investigations.


Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 125



State of Indiana
Mitchell E. Daniels Jr., Governor - James W. Payne, Director
402 West Washington Street, Room W392 / Indianapolis, IN 46204-2739

Source of Initial Child Abuse and Neglect Reports State Fiscal Year 2004



Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Year End Reports
-Report 151





Child Abuse / Neglect Summary by County

State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

County	Sexual Abuse		Physical Abuse		Neglect	
	Sub	Unsub	Sub	Unsub	Sub	Unsub
Adams	10	17	10	36	16	82
Allen	213	307	156	595	502	1,862
Bartholomew	38	117	17	125	135	677
Benton	2	1	6	18	20	60
Blackford	11	16	5	29	8	103
Boone	19	30	18	43	95	144
Brown	10	22	7	18	30	74
Carroll	16	15	15	10	26	57
Cass	53	48	20	40	79	188
Clark	95	162	101	231	624	812
Clay	16	32	16	40	46	98
Clinton	39	52	18	83	72	249
Crawford	27	32	13	25	75	109
Daviess	11	11	12	29	82	105
DeKalb	34	58	46	81	155	348
Dearborn	9	31	26	60	81	233
Decatur	30	39	21	69	68	232
Delaware	72	67	58	95	283	566
DuBois	37	24	20	45	61	75
Elkhart	129	288	71	245	207	930
Fayette	40	57	32	57	107	222
Floyd	46	45	28	117	256	381
Fountain	12	24	7	32	32	92
Franklin	10	17	4	24	26	103
Fulton	18	16	24	51	45	83
Gibson	15	18	17	44	99	150
Grant	79	86	31	90	227	522
Greene	50	61	38	46	165	324
Hamilton	106	68	28	101	49	240
Hancock	18	37	21	62	101	164
Harrison	42	30	25	32	95	244
Hendricks	42	59	44	56	106	203
Henry	24	54	19	63	147	217
Howard	38	114	50	91	218	282
Huntington	40	40	31	80	28	250
Jackson	37	44	24	46	187	363
Jasper	4	14	18	18	27	65
Jay	29	28	16	54	49	165
Jefferson	35	82	15	67	73	392
Jennings	36	64	49	94	209	297
Johnson	41	104	33	175	169	757
Knox	24	26	15	37	115	269
Kosciusko	58	56	30	86	116	210
LaGrange	46	69	33	80	105	247
Lake	171	195	200	569	579	1,336
Laporte	74	122	79	274	217	712

County	Sexual Abuse		Physical Abuse		Neglect	
	Sub	Unsub	Sub	Unsub	Sub	Unsub
Lawrence	36	54	33	73	59	203
Madison	112	150	59	295	218	845
Marion	890	1,627	634	2,509	1,846	4,177
Marshall	36	26	28	63	142	208
Martin	5	11	6	20	31	31
Miami	33	31	41	41	83	106
Monroe	71	114	83	190	289	761
Montgomery	25	39	26	56	168	320
Morgan	50	28	41	69	145	291
Newton	9	11	1	14	34	59
Noble	33	41	26	80	102	310
Ohio	3	5	4	10	15	18
Orange	10	48	10	48	40	211
Owen	25	40	15	48	40	124
Parke	17	19	5	26	19	113
Perry	8	32	8	45	42	210
Pike	9	17	15	21	80	64
Porter	54	54	68	77	366	289
Posey	9	30	13	35	34	141
Pulaski	7	19	13	28	23	77
Putnam	31	52	21	25	113	240
Randolph	34	38	25	49	31	145
Ripley	12	16	21	36	61	177
Rush	3	28	7	27	26	93
Saint Joseph	313	246	246	212	522	529
Scott	31	53	28	95	214	290
Shelby	52	67	42	82	133	385
Spencer	9	10	6	17	37	69
Starke	20	8	17	50	33	117
Steuben	16	36	35	106	125	409
Sullivan	17	20	18	22	85	156
Switzerland	13	20	6	25	33	118
Tippecanoe	61	130	49	129	350	777
Tipton	8	20	5	15	14	51
Union	4	2	10	4	23	33
Vanderburgh	131	259	130	364	581	1,273
Vermillion	7	14	6	26	17	92
Vigo	93	109	60	158	201	655
Wabash	42	52	34	61	51	111
Warren	8	3	3	27	21	55
Warrick	28	61	27	139	143	320
Washington	32	39	10	70	38	273
Wayne	71	90	46	130	193	592
Wells	31	61	11	63	59	139
White	13	29	15	35	18	95
Whitley	11	14	9	23	18	88
Total	4,539	6,772	3,583	10,101	13,128	31,134

Note: Sub= Substantiated Unsub=Unsubstantiated

A child is counted in only one category per investigation using the old Federal hierarchy of Sexual Abuse, Physical Abuse, then Neglect.


Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 125, 126, and 127





Number of Abuse and Neglect Children Per 1,000 Population Under The Age of 18 Substantiated Cases for State Fiscal Year 2004



A child is counted in only one category per investigation using the old Federal hierarchy of Sexual Abuse, Physical Abuse, then Neglect.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 125



Demographic Characteristics of Children by Age and Gender

State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Sexual Abuse

Age Range	Substantiated				Unsubstantiated			
	Male	Female	Unavailable	Total	Male	Female	Unavailable	Total
0 - 3 yrs	51	138	0	189	242	668	3	913
4 - 6 yrs	284	382	3	669	516	799	0	1,315
7 - 12 yrs	404	1,134	8	1,546	645	1,312	4	1,961
13 -> yrs	235	1,672	5	1,912	297	1,508	6	1,811
Unavailable	101	215	1	317	338	711	18	1,067
Total	1,075	3,541	17	4,633	2,038	4,998	31	7,067

Physical Abuse

Age Range	Substantiated				Unsubstantiated			
	Male	Female	Unavailable	Total	Male	Female	Unavailable	Total
0 - 3 yrs	350	256	1	607	1,133	908	5	2,046
4 - 6 yrs	318	237	3	558	1,102	788	1	1,891
7 - 12 yrs	704	535	1	1,240	1,977	1,469	3	3,449
13 -> yrs	429	608	3	1,040	852	1,400	16	2,268
Unavailable	122	97	0	219	766	633	24	1,423
Total	1,923	1,733	8	3,664	5,830	5,198	49	11,077


Neglect

Age Range	Substantiated				Unsubstantiated			
	Male	Female	Unavailable	Total	Male	Female	Unavailable	Total
0 - 3 yrs	2,706	2,543	25	5,274	4,900	4,562	38	9,500
4 - 6 yrs	1,453	1,330	2	2,785	3,474	3,312	15	6,801
7 - 12 yrs	2,074	2,026	13	4,113	5,984	551	36	6,571
13 -> yrs	991	1,283	5	2,279	2,703	3,802	40	6,545
Unavailable	376	337	25	738	2,663	2,729	207	5,599
Total	7,600	7,519	70	15,189	19,724	19,916	336	39,976

On all tables, the same child may be counted in more than one category for the same investigation.



Type of Abuse and Neglect by Age Group (Substantiated Investigations) State Fiscal Year 2004



The same child may be counted in more than one category of abuse/ neglect for the same investigation

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Year End Report
-Report 137





**Demographic Characteristics of Children
by Race and Gender of Children
(Substantiated Investigations)
State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)**

Race	Physical			Sexual			Neglect		
	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown
American Indian or Alaskan Native	23	36	0	16	51	0	90	107	1
Asian	5	7	0	2	7	0	20	16	0
Black or African American	396	371	4	154	516	5	1,264	1,179	12
Multiracial	53	54	0	30	66	0	259	268	2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	2	0	0	7	0	7	6	0
Unable to Determine	7	13	0	11	34	1	40	40	4
White	1,438	1,250	4	862	2,860	11	5,920	5,903	51
Total By Gender	1,923	1,733	8	1,075	3,541	17	7,600	7,519	70
Total	3,664			4,633			15,189		

**Demographic Characteristics of Children by Hispanic Origin, Race, and Gender
(Substantiated Investigations)**

State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Non - Hispanic

Race	Physical			Sexual			Neglect		
	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	5	0	0	6	0	12	13	0
Asian	5	7	0	2	5	0	20	12	0
Black or African American	396	369	4	154	509	5	1,254	1,171	12
Multiracial	48	50	0	24	54	0	231	237	2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	1	0	0	6	0	7	5	0
Unable to Determine	7	11	0	9	26	1	34	37	4
White	1,376	1,196	4	841	2,749	11	5,697	5,650	50
Total By Gender	1,835	1,639	8	1,030	335	17	7,255	7,125	68

Hispanic

Race	Physical			Sexual			Neglect		
	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown	Male	Female	Unknown
American Indian or Alaskan Native	20	31	0	16	45	0	78	94	1
Asian	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0
Black or African American	0	2	0	0	7	0	10	8	0
Multiracial	5	4	0	6	12	0	28	31	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Unable to Determine	0	2	0	2	8	0	6	3	0
White	62	54	0	21	111	0	223	253	1
Total By Gender	88	94	0	45	186	0	345	394	2

On all tables, the same child may be counted in more than one category for the same investigation.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 137_2_141





Investigation Statistics

Types of Maltreatment for Abuse and Neglect

State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Sexual Abuse

Maltreatment Type	Age 0 - 3	Age 4 - 6	Age 7 - 12	Age 13 +	Age - Not Available	Total
Incest	75	130	228	258	59	750
Exploitation/Pornography	10	24	64	45	19	162
Rape	4	8	83	510	85	690
Child Molesting	1,184	2,084	3,713	2,005	1,165	10,151
Criminal Deviate Conduct	57	170	286	300	154	967
Child Seduction	2	1	2	209	25	239
Prostitution	0	0	14	32	6	52
Indecent Exposure	38	33	75	44	33	223
Sexual Misconduct with a Minor	8	13	35	1,680	220	1,956
Harmful/Obscene Performance	8	33	32	25	11	109
Living in home with sexual perpetrator	0	0	0	0	0	0

Physical Abuse

Maltreatment Type	Age 0 - 3	Age 4 - 6	Age 7 - 12	Age 13 +	Age - Not Available	Total
Bruises/Cuts/Welts	1,670	1,743	3,167	2,285	999	9,864
Wounds/Punctures/Bites	77	58	82	76	21	314
Bone Fracture	341	29	36	41	26	473
Internal Injury	54	11	16	19	10	110
Skull Fractures/Brain Damage	97	2	4	1	4	108
Burns/Scalds	276	144	153	38	65	676
Poisoning	13	2	7	3	2	27
Asphyxiation/Suffocation	34	13	16	42	14	119
Shaking/Dislocation/Sprains	72	18	19	15	13	137
Drowning	8	5	2	0	0	15
Inappropriate Discipline	1,485	1,818	3,861	2,781	1,382	11,327
Gunshot Wounds	4	1	5	3	1	14
Shaken Baby Syndrome	87	0	1	0	2	90
Alcohol Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0

On both tables, the same child may be counted in more than one category for the same investigation.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 145_146





Investigation Statistics
Types of Maltreatment for Abuse and Neglect
State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Neglect

Maltreatment Type	Age 0 - 3	Age 4 - 6	Age 7 - 12	Age 13 +	Age - Not Available	Total
Lack of Supervision	7,067	5,169	7,536	4,064	3,151	26,987
Failure to Thrive	153	9	16	5	8	191
Malnutrition	173	33	45	15	26	292
Medical Neglect	1,517	630	1,049	683	382	4,261
Educational Neglect	52	453	1,637	944	297	3,383
Abandonment	314	166	281	523	114	1,398
Close/Confinement	69	82	73	39	35	298
Lock In/Out	228	240	343	236	129	1,176
Lack of Food,Shelter,Clothing	2,822	1,872	2,984	1,622	1,287	10,587
Environment Life/Health						
Endangering	15,938	9,737	15,195	7,865	6,504	55,239
Poor Hygiene	2,062	1,302	1,735	550	686	6,335
Drug Related Conditions (child)	993	203	369	363	267	2,195
Fetal Alcohol Syndrome	7	1	0	1	0	9

The same child may be counted in more than one category for the same investigation.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 145_146





Investigation Statistics

Perpetrator Profile of Substantiated Investigations

State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Perpetrator Relationship to Victim	Sexual Abuse	Physical Abuse	Neglect
Adoptive Grandparent	0	1	3
Aunt	8	31	123
Baby Sitter	52	57	127
Boyfriend of Parent	225	350	680
Brother	246	14	42
Brother-In-Law	7	0	1
CC (Child Care) Facilities Staff	1	3	25
CCH (Child Care Home) Staff	1	3	17
Daughter	0	0	2
Father	296	1,202	4,489
Father-in law	0	0	0
First Cousin	257	9	7
First Cousin, Once Removed	25	2	5
Foster Father	8	13	33
Foster Mother	2	24	56
GAL (Guardian Ad Litem)	0	0	2
Girlfriend of Parent	7	37	86
Grandchild	0	0	0
Grandfather	111	26	113
Grandmother	7	63	348
Great Aunt	0	0	6
Great Grandfather	5	0	5
Great Uncle	11	0	2
Great grandmother	0	0	20
Half Brother	147	12	23
Half Sister	10	3	14

Perpetrator Relationship to Victim	Sexual Abuse	Physical Abuse	Neglect
Husband	1	0	1
Institution Staff	16	46	48
Legal Guardian	2	17	47
Mother	32	1,239	11,813
Mother- in law	0	0	0
Nephew	4	0	2
Niece	5	0	0
None	1,815	66	269
Other	306	34	86
Other Relative	53	3	18
Other Specified Relative	1	3	4
Pre Adoptive Father	2	0	0
Pre Adoptive Mother	0	0	0
Resident	79	1	4
Sister	22	14	27
Sister-In-Law	0	2	2
Son	1	0	1
Stepbrother	96	2	7
Stepfather	235	339	670
Stepmother	0	75	134
Stepsister	9	7	0
Stepson	0	0	0
Teacher	22	24	11
Unavailable	401	60	129
Uncle	221	36	97
Wife	1	0	0
Total	4,750	3,818	19,603

The same perpetrator may be counted in more than one category for the same investigation.


One perpetrator may have more than one victim. The perpetrator may also have a different relationship with each victim. Therefore, one perpetrator may appear multiple times in the same category.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 157_3-159



Relationship of Perpetrator to Victim Substantiated Investigations State Fiscal Year 2004



Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 157





**Substantiated Investigations of Abuse and Neglect
By Hispanic Origin and Race of Perpetrator
State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)**

Race	Physical			Sexual			Neglect		
	Total	Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Total	Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Total	Non-Hispanic	Hispanic
American Indian or Alaskan Native	47	5	46	78	13	75	122	14	124
Asian	9	10	0	5	3	1	25	19	6
Black or African American	716	747	1	615	659	3	1,543	1,503	3
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	3	3	5	2	0	11	7	1
White	2,548	2,412	94	3,009	2,874	144	8,375	9,103	247
Unable to Determine	121	133	7	380	371	20	118	127	9
Multiracial	17	14	3	18	22	3	62	58	14
Total	3,463	3,324	154	4,110	3,944	246	10,256	10,831	404

**Substantiated Investigations of Abuse and Neglect
By Sex of Perpetrator
State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)**

Sex	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Neglect
Female	1,450	280	7,426
Male	1,928	3,835	3,735
Unknown	102	75	74
Total	3,480	4,190	11,235


On all tables, the same perpetrator may be counted in more than one category for the same investigation.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 157_159



Institutional Child Abuse and Neglect Reports State Fiscal Years 1996 to 2004




Data from 1996 to 1998 used Federal hierarchy. Each Investigation is counted in only one category per investigation.

From 1997 to 2000, unsubstantiated cases were expunged and no aggregate data was kept.

Data from 1999 to 2003 the same investigation may be counted in each category. So a case with Physical and Sexual Abuse may be counted twice in the abuse total.

Institutional Child Abuse Reports (Substantiated Investigations) State Fiscal Years 1996 to 2004



Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Report
-Report 163





Institutional Investigation Statistics **Types of Maltreatment for Physical Abuse by Race and Gender** **State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)**

Allegation	Race and Sex																							
	American Indian / Alaskan						Asian						Black						Nat Hawaiian/Pac Islander					
	Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic		
	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U
Alcohol Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asphyxiation/Suffocation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bone Fracture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bruises/Cuts/Welts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burns/Scalds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Death	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drowning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gunshot Wounds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inappropriate Discipline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internal Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poisoning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shaken Baby Syndrome	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shaking/Dislocation/Sprains	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Skull Fractures/Brain Damage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wounds/Punctures/Bites	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Allegation	Race and Sex																		Total
	White						Unavailable						Multiracial						
	Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			
	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	
Alcohol Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asphyxiation/Suffocation	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bone Fracture	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bruises/Cuts/Welts	1	3	0	33	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	1	0	0	0
Burns/Scalds	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Death	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drowning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gunshot Wounds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inappropriate Discipline	2	1	0	31	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Internal Injury	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poisoning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shaken Baby Syndrome	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shaking/Dislocation/Sprains	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Skull Fractures/Brain Damage	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wounds/Punctures/Bites	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

M=Male, F=Female, U=Unavailable

The same child may be counted in multiple allegations.

Institutional Investigations are investigations of a child who may have been abused or neglected by a care giver who is not a parent or guardian.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 164-165





Institutional Investigation Statistics

Types of Maltreatment for Sexual Abuse by Race and Gender

State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Allegation	Race and Sex																							
	American Indian / Alaskan						Asian						Black						Nat Hawaiian/Pac Islander					
	Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic		
	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U
Child Molesting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child Seduction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Criminal Deviate Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exploitation/Pornography	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harmful/Obscene Performance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indecent Exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual Misconduct with a Minor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Allegation	Race and Sex																		Total
	White						Unavailable						Multiracial						
	Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			
	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	
Child Molesting	1	0	0	66	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	176
Child Seduction	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Criminal Deviate Conduct	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Exploitation/Pornography	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harmful/Obscene Performance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indecent Exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sexual Misconduct with a Minor	0	1	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

M=Male, F=Female, U=Unavailable

The same child may be counted in multiple allegations.

Institutional Investigations are investigations of a child who may have been abused or neglected by a care giver who is not a parent or guardian.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 164-165





Institutional Investigation Statistics

Types of Maltreatment for Neglect by Race and Gender

State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Allegation	Race and Sex																							
	American Indian /						Asian						Black						Nat Hawaiian/Pac					
	Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic		
	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U
Abandonment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Close / Confinement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Death	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Related Conditions(child)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environment Life/Health																								
Endangering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Failure to Thrive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fetal Alcohol Syndrome	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of Food, Shelter, Clothing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of Supervision	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lock In/Out	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malnutrition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor Hygiene	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Allegation	Race and Sex																		Total
	White						Unavailable						Multiracial						
	Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			Hispanic			Non-Hispanic			
	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	M	F	U	
Abandonment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Close / Confinement	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Death	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Related Conditions(child)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational Neglect	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environment Life/Health																			
Endangering	0	0	0	26	22	2	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0
Failure to Thrive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fetal Alcohol Syndrome	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of Food, Shelter, Clothing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of Supervision	0	1	0	50	39	2	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	0
Lock In/Out	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malnutrition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Neglect	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor Hygiene	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

M=Male, F=Female, U=Unavailable

The same child may be counted in multiple allegations.

Institutional Investigations are investigations of a child who may have been abused or neglected by a care giver who is not a parent or guardian.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 164-165



Institutional Investigation Statistics
Types of Maltreatment for Abuse and Neglect by Age
(Substantiated Investigations)
State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Physical Abuse

Allegation	Total	Age Group				Not Reported
		0 to 3	4 to 6	7 to 12	13 +	
Alcohol Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asphyxiation/Suffocation	2	0	0	0	2	0
Bone Fracture	5	1	0	0	3	1
Bruises/Cuts/Welts	65	12	4	10	34	5
Burns/Scalds	2	2	0	0	0	0
Death	1	1	0	0	0	0
Drowning	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse Child	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gunshot Wounds	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inappropriate Discipline	74	8	11	22	28	5
Internal Injury	2	0	0	0	2	0
Poisoning	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shaken Baby Syndrome	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shaking/Dislocation/Sprains	1	0	0	0	1	0
Skull Fractures/Brain Damage	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wounds/Punctures/Bites	3	1	1	0	1	0

Neglect

Allegation	Total	Age Group				Not Reported
		0 to 3	4 to 6	7 to 12	13 +	
Abandonment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Close/Confinement	5	2	3	0	0	0
Death	2	2	0	0	0	0
Drug Related Conditions (child)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environment Life/Health Endangering	105	31	19	14	31	10
Failure to Thrive	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fetal Alcohol Syndrome	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of Food,Shelter,Clothing	2	0	0	0	2	0
Lack of Supervision	128	35	39	18	36	0
Lock In/Out	7	3	3	1	0	0
Malnutrition	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Neglect	6	3	1	1	1	0
Poor Hygiene	0	0	0	0	0	0

Sexual Abuse

Allegation	Total	Age Group				Not Reported
		0 to 3	4 to 6	7 to 12	13 +	
Child Molesting	176	3	20	76	67	10
Child Seduction	7	0	0	0	6	1
Criminal Deviate Conduct	9	0	0	0	9	0
Exploitation/Pornography	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harmful/Obscene Performance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Incest	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indecent Exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual Misconduct with a Minor	3	0	0	0	2	1

On all tables, the same child may be counted in more than one category for the same investigation.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 164-165





Institutional Investigation Statistics By Facility State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)

Facility	Substantiated Investigations			Unsubstantiated Investigations			Total Investigations	
	Sexual	Physical	Neglect	Sexual	Physical	Neglect	Abuse	Neglect
Child Care Center	2	5	14	8	16	23	31	37
Child Caring Institution	47	10	2	31	41	15	129	17
Children, Youth and Families	2	0	1	3	3	2	8	3
Correctional Institution/Facilities	18	20	5	7	9	4	54	9
Court	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Court Approved Placement -not licensed	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Day Care Home	11	13	19	19	29	54	72	73
Developmental Disabilities Services/ Agencies	0	1	3	1	5	1	7	4
Emergency Shelter	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Foster Care Home	24	17	25	60	92	118	186	143
Group Home	3	1	3	2	3	8	9	11
Head Start Center	0	0	1	2	2	4	4	5
Health Services	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Hospital Other than a State Hosp.	3	0	2	0	5	4	8	6
Housing & Environmental Services	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1
Licensed Child Placing Agency	0	0	0	1	4	2	5	2
Mental Health and Addictions Services	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Ministry	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
Neighborhood Centers	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	1
Nursing Home	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Private Secure Facility	4	1	0	1	3	3	9	3
Registered Child Care Ministry	2	2	7	3	10	19	17	26
Relative Home	0	0	2	0	4	3	4	5
Schools	23	21	9	108	76	65	227	74
Special Groups & Services	0	0	2	7	3	3	10	5
State Hospital	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2
Totals	142	93	97	256	309	336	792	433


Institutional Investigations are investigations of a child who may have been abused or neglected while in the care of someone other than a parent or guardian.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 163



Number of Foster Homes and Residential Placement Facilities On June 30 of the State Fiscal Years 1993-2004




Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 123



Statewide Adoptions State Fiscal Year 1999 to SFY 2004



Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Ad Hoc Query
-ran 04/25/2005 and 04/21/2005



SFY 2004 Adoptions By County, Gender, and Age Group

County	Gender	Age Group																		Grand Total	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17		18
Adams	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Adams Total		0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Allen	Female	0	0	1	1	5	1	2	2	0	3	1	4	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	27
	Male	0	0	5	3	1	1	2	4	2	0	3	1	1	4	0	2	0	3	0	32
Allen Total		0	0	6	4	6	2	4	6	2	3	4	5	1	6	2	3	1	3	1	59
Bartholomew	Male	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Bartholomew Total		0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Blackford	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Blackford Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Boone	Female	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Boone Total		0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Cass	Female	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	
	Male	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Cass Total		1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Central Office	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Central Office Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Clark	Female	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Male	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9
Clark Total		0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12
Clay	Female	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	
	Male	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	
Clay Total		1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	11
Clinton	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	
	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Clinton Total		0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	
Crawford	Female	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Male	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Crawford Total		0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Daviess	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	
	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Daviess Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	
Dearborn	Female	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	5	
Dearborn Total		0	0	2	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	11	
Decatur	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Decatur Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	
DeKalb	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
DeKalb Total		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
Delaware	Female	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
	Male	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	8	
Delaware Total		0	0	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	12	

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Ad Hoc Query
-ran 04/25/2005 and 04/21/2005



SFY 2004 Adoptions By County, Gender, and Age Group

County	Gender	Age Group																		Grand Total	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17		18
DuBois	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
	Male	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
DuBois Total		1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
Elkhart	Female	0	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	5	1	0	0	1	2	0	21
	Male	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	15
Elkhart Total		0	0	6	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	5	1	3	0	1	2	0	36
Fayette	Female	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
	Male	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Fayette Total		1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7
Floyd	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Floyd Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Gibson	Female	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Gibson Total		0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Grant	Female	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Male	0	0	2	1	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
Grant Total		0	0	2	3	4	1	2	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	18
Greene	Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
	Male	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	5
Greene Total		0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	10
Hamilton	Male	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Hamilton Total		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Hancock	Female	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Hancock Total		0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Harrison	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Harrison Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Hendricks	Female	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hendricks Total		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Henry	Female	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Male	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Henry Total		0	2	3	3	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Howard	Female	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Howard Total		0	1	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Huntington	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Huntington Total		0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Jasper	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Jasper Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Jay	Male	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Jay Total		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Ad Hoc Query
-ran 04/25/2005 and 04/21/2005



SFY 2004 Adoptions By County, Gender, and Age Group

County	Gender	Age Group																		Grand Total	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17		18
Jefferson	Male	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Jefferson Total		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Knox	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
	Male	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Knox Total		0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9
Kosciusko	Female	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Male	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
Kosciusko Total		0	1	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	10
LaGrange	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LaGrange Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Lake	Female	0	1	8	6	1	5	4	5	1	3	4	5	5	2	3	3	3	0	0	59
	Male	0	1	8	7	5	4	5	1	6	4	1	2	4	2	3	0	3	0	0	56
Lake Total		0	2	16	13	6	9	9	6	7	7	5	7	9	4	6	3	6	0	0	115
Laporte	Female	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
	Male	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Laporte Total		2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11
Lawrence	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lawrence Total		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Madison	Female	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Madison Total		0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Marion	Female	2	24	18	13	15	13	10	12	10	6	7	9	10	3	4	4	3	2	1	166
	Male	5	21	26	17	13	16	16	16	10	3	12	13	2	11	6	1	3	1	0	192
Marion Total		7	45	44	30	28	29	26	28	20	9	19	22	12	14	10	5	6	3	1	358
Marshall	Male	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Marshall Total		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Martin	Female	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Martin Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Miami	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Miami Total		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Monroe	Female	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	9
	Male	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	16
Monroe Total		0	0	0	2	1	5	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	25
Montgomery	Female	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Male	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Montgomery Total		0	0	0	1	1	4	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Morgan	Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
Morgan Total		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
Noble	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4
Noble Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	5

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Ad Hoc Query
-ran 04/25/2005 and 04/21/2005



SFY 2004 Adoptions By County, Gender, and Age Group

County	Gender	Age Group																		Grand Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Ohio	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ohio Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Perry	Male	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Perry Total		0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Porter	Female	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
Porter Total		0	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Pulaski	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Pulaski Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3
Putnam	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Putnam Total		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
Randolph	Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Randolph Total		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Ripley	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	6
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Ripley Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	9
Rush	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Rush Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Saint Joseph	Female	0	4	3	4	3	6	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	37
	Male	1	6	5	2	1	3	2	3	3	1	2	2	1	4	0	1	0	1	38
Saint Joseph Total		1	10	8	6	4	9	4	5	5	2	4	4	3	5	1	3	0	1	75
Scott	Female	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Scott Total		0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
Shelby	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Shelby Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Starke	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Starke Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Steuben	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Steuben Total		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sullivan	Female	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sullivan Total		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Tippecanoe	Female	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	12
	Male	0	0	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Tippecanoe Total		0	0	6	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	21
Vanderburgh	Female	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	16
	Male	0	2	4	3	2	1	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	23
Vanderburgh Total		0	3	4	5	2	3	5	2	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	39

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Ad Hoc Query
-ran 04/25/2005 and 04/21/2005



SFY 2004 Adoptions By County, Gender, and Age Group

County	Gender	Age Group																		Grand Total	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17		18
Vermillion	Female	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Vermillion Total		0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Vigo	Female	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
	Male	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Vigo Total		1	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	13
Warrick	Male	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Warrick Total		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wayne	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Male	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Wayne Total		0	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Wells	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wells Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
White	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
White Total		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Whitley	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Whitley Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total		16	78	130	111	79	81	73	76	59	44	52	57	48	42	32	22	29	21	4	1,054

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Ad Hoc Query
-ran 04/25/2005 and 04/21/2005





Children Free for Adoption **by Age, Gender, Race and Type of Placement** **State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)**

Non - Finalized Adoptive Placement

Age	Sex	American Indian / Alaskan		Asian		Black		Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander		White		Multiracial		Unavailable	
		H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH
Under 1 Year	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 - 2 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
3 - 5 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
6 - 8 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	10	2	2	0	1
9 - 11 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	3
12 - 14 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
15 - 17 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
18 - 20 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Unknown	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		0	0	0	0	0	80	0	0	3	89	4	5	0	7

Table excludes private adoptions.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 168





Children Free for Adoption **by Age, Gender, Race and Type of Placement** **State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)**

Not In Adoptive Placement
(includes children adopted by Foster Parent who is receiving per diem)

Age	Sex	American Indian / Alaskan		Asian		Black		Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander		White		Multiracial		Unavailable	
		H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH	H	NH
Under 1 Year	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
1 - 2 Years	Male	0	0	0	1	1	15	0	0	2	22	0	3	0	3
	Female	1	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	19	0	5	0	5
3 - 5 Years	Male	2	2	0	2	3	41	0	0	2	49	0	7	1	19
	Female	4	0	0	4	1	37	0	0	2	45	0	7	0	10
6 - 8 Years	Male	1	0	0	1	0	45	0	0	1	48	0	4	0	12
	Female	0	2	0	5	1	34	1	0	4	47	0	4	0	10
9 - 11 Years	Male	0	3	0	0	0	62	0	0	1	71	1	8	1	16
	Female	0	1	0	0	0	47	0	0	4	47	1	5	0	14
12 - 14 Years	Male	1	3	0	0	0	78	0	0	0	84	0	7	2	21
	Female	1	1	0	0	0	59	0	0	1	74	0	2	0	11
15 - 17 Years	Male	0	1	0	0	0	51	0	0	1	92	0	3	1	15
	Female	1	1	0	0	0	51	0	0	1	69	0	0	0	10
18 - 20 Years	Male	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	29	0	1	0	9
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	3	24	0	0	0	8
Unknown	Male	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	17
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	15
Total		11	14	0	13	6	586	1	0	22	731	2	58	5	196

Table excludes private adoptions.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 168





Children Free for Adoption **by Age, Gender, Race and Type of Placement** **State Fiscal Year 2004 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)**

Not In Adoptive Placement and Non - Finalized Adoptive Placement
(includes children adopted by Foster Parent who is receiving per diem)

Age	Sex	Total Free for Adoption
Under 1 Year	Male	0
	Female	2
1 - 2 Years	Male	55
	Female	63
3 - 5 Years	Male	141
	Female	120
6 - 8 Years	Male	134
	Female	132
9 - 11 Years	Male	182
	Female	139
12 - 14 Years	Male	214
	Female	163
15 - 17 Years	Male	176
	Female	145
18 - 20 Years	Male	56
	Female	63
Unknown	Male	26
	Female	22
Total		1,833

Table excludes private adoptions.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
ICWIS Annual Reports
-Report 168





Department of Child Services

Child Support

In 2005, the Bureau of Child Support was incorporated into the newly created Department of Child Services (DCS). DCS was legislated as the state agency to oversee child welfare issues. The Bureau of Child Support helps Indiana's children and families by enforcing parental responsibility through the collection of payments by non-custodial parents. The Child Support Program provides a full range of child support services including establishment of paternity, establishment and enforcement of child support orders, collection and distribution of child support payments, and location of absent parents.

Title IV-D (Child Support and Establishment of Paternity) of the Federal Social Security Act, enacted in 1975, required that a Child Support Program be established in every state that chose to participate in the IV-A programs. The Child Support Program became effective in Indiana on October 1, 1976 under the provisions of IC-12-17-2. The Indiana Child Support Program is administered by the Child Support Bureau of the Indiana Department of Child Services.

In Indiana, the Child Support Bureau has entered into cooperative agreements with the local county prosecutors in all Indiana counties to provide child support enforcement services. The Bureau also has cooperative agreements with the Clerks of Circuit Courts for collecting support payments and with several courts to set up Special Hearing Officers specifically to adjudicate Title IV-D cases.

Every child has the right to the care and support of both parents whether or not the parents are married or both in the home. The child support program enforces this right. Child support services are offered through local County Prosecutors' Offices. These services include:

- Locating absent parents
- Establishing paternity
- Establishing and enforcing support orders
- Establishing and enforcing medical support orders
- Collecting current and past due support payments
- Review and adjustment of current support orders

This program is available free of charge to anyone receiving TANF, Hoosier Healthwise or Medicaid for their children. Parents receiving TANF or Medicaid for their children are required to pursue child support services (the IV-D program) through the local County Prosecutor's Office.

Any other family that is in need of these services can receive them for a one-time application fee of \$25.00. Anyone interested in receiving these services can do so by their local County Prosecutors Office. In order to receive the child support services of the Prosecutor's office, it is critical that all necessary information is provided by the person applying for services. All information requested is necessary in order to provide the best possible service. All information provided is strictly confidential.

The Child Support Program has several tools available to enforce child support obligations. These tools include:

- Income withholding
- Liens of property
- Interception of income tax refunds (state and federal)





Department of Child Services

- Interception of unemployment compensation benefits.
- Interception of lottery winnings
- Credit bureau reporting
- Driver and professional, and recreational license suspension
- Financial institution data cross matching
- New hire reporting
- Computer automation of its operations, including interfaces with numerous other computer systems.
- Child support action plans in all 92 local offices aimed at improving communications with local child support offices and improving service to the public.
- An automated child support system
- A web site for employers to process income withholding on line.

The impact of the Child Support Program collection efforts for the citizens of Indiana can be seen in the collection figures for the State Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2004. During this year the Child Support Bureau collected \$454,873,530. During the first year of operation, the Bureau collected \$5,700,000. These increased collections mean more Indiana children are receiving the child support they deserve and that fewer Indiana families will have to resort to public assistance to survive.

At the end of June, 2004, there were 1,757 employers using the Child Support payment web site. Additionally, there were an uncounted number of employers remitting payments through electronic funds transfers. Electronic direct deposit of payments for distribution of collections was initiated in November, 2000. Electronic fund transfers from employers were initiated February 1999. Through the end of the calendar year 2004, an estimated \$455 million had been collected.

Each year, the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OSCO) reviews performance for order establishment, paternity establishment, current support collected, and cases paying on arrears. The performance-based audit standards were phased in between FFY 2000 and 2002. In each area performance is assessed by comparing the number of cases upon which action is to be taken with those upon which the required action has been taken, as reported in the ISETS database.

For example, for order establishment, the number of cases upon which orders need to be established is compared with the number of cases upon which an order has been established. The performance is measured as a percentage. Indiana continues to improve performance measure scores in all areas. This has resulted in increased incentives received by Indiana from the federal government. Please refer to the attached Indiana Statewide Performance and Incentives Report comparing Indiana's performance scores to the national averages as well as detailing Indiana's scores from 2000 – 2003. For SFY 2004, 47 Indiana counties were at or above the national average of 59% for current support. For specific county performance measures and scores please refer to the attached County Performance Measure report for FFY 2000 – 2004.

The reliability of Child Support data in the Indiana State Enforcement Tracking System (ISETS) determines the effectiveness of the Child Support Program and the incentive monies received. Regardless of how high Indiana's performance ratios are in the four substantive areas, in order to actually qualify for incentives. OCSE makes this determination by randomly selecting approximately 200 cases statewide. The paper case files are reviewed and compared to the ISETS system data, as of September 30. The auditors review the system data to ensure that, among other things, all court order information is reflected correctly in ISETS and that all paternity





Department of Child Services

indicators are accurate. Cases are reviewed for accuracy for each of the four substantive measures.

In 2001 data reliability issues were identified. There were a number of factors contributing to this issue. Factors included but were not limited to the following:

- 1) Data conversion from the prosecutors and clerk's data into the ISETS system.
- 2) Miscommunication between child support staff and local office staff resulting in incorrect paternity data codes being entered in the Indiana Client Eligibility System (ICES) thus affecting the paternity establishment percentage in the ICES/ISETS interface.
- 3) Insufficient data being entered into ICES for non-custodial parents resulting in the interface between ISETS and ICES creating an entire new case instead of linking to an existing case already in the system. This created duplicate cases.

In a successful effort to address the data reliability issues, state and county child support staff reviewed and corrected approximately 145,000 cases. Also, a training program for local office of family and children staff was initiated and developed with input from child support in an effort to address this issue on an on-going basis. These collaborations contributed to successful results in addressing the problem as documented in the Indiana Statewide Performance and Incentives Reports detailing the progressive improvement in the data reliability scores from Federal Fiscal Year 2000 – 2003.

For additional information about the Child Support program please visit the following websites:

The Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement
<http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cse/>

The Federal Office of Child Support Data
http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cse/pubs/2004/reports/preliminary_data/

Indiana Child Support Guidelines
<http://www.in.gov/judiciary/rules>

Child Support Data

Indiana State Enforcement Tracking System (ISETS) is a statewide reporting system for child support payments. The system collects, posts, and disperses support payments for all Indiana counties. Child Support data is tracked by court orders and reported by child support payments.

A court order could involve multiple children, multiple payers and or multiple families/households. Also, IV-D cases are tracked for federal reporting purposes but non IV-D cases are not. Consequently data regarding the total number of families and children served by this program is not available.





Department of Child Services

Indiana Support Enforcement Tracking System (ISETS)

Project Description

The Indiana Support Enforcement Tracking System (ISETS) is a federally mandated online, automated, and integrated case management and case tracking software system. ISETS supports Clerks and Prosecutors in all 92 of Indiana's counties to record, track, collect, and disburse court ordered child support payments. In addition, the ISETS integrates with other systems, agencies, and employers to enhance locate and payment efforts. These include:

- Driver license suspensions;
- Employer wage and UI withholdings;
- TANF benefits recovery;
- Federal and State tax offset collections;
- Professional license suspensions; and
- Credit bureau reporting.

ISETS is used primarily by county workers in each county's Clerk of Courts office and Child Support Prosecutor's Office. There are approximately 84 State staff located centrally in the Child Support Bureau, Department of Child Services, that use the system for central office functions of processing payments, balancing adjustments, answering inquiry calls, correspondence, central registry cases, and enforcement activities.

A team of trained technical professionals monitor and maintain the ISETS software to ensure that it conforms to all Federal and State regulations, laws, and requirements. The data housed within ISETS is used to comply with Federal reporting requirements. The ISETS system achieved full Federal certification from the Office of Child Support Enforcement for both FS88 and PRWORA certification objectives in July, 2002.

History

In 1992, IBM won a competitive bid contract to transfer the KASES system from Kentucky, modify it to meet Indiana's needs, and implement it as the ISETS system. During the ensuing 8 years, IBM left the contract and other vendors worked to implement the system county by county. In October, 1999, Marion County was the last county implemented thus completing the initial implementation of the system.

In 2000 and 2001, software modifications were completed to bring ISETS into full compliance with Federal certification requirements for both the FS88 and PRWORA legislations. Indiana formally received full Federal certification in March, 2002, the first state in the Midwest region to accomplish this task, and only the 17th state nationally to do so. Certification is an important hurdle as it assures the State of continued federal matching funds of over \$10.5 M annually.

Numbers and profiles of population served: Approximately 747,800 Child Support Cases

The project is guided by goals to: maintain ISETS system in compliance with all Federal and State regulations, laws, and requirements; ensure that ISETS system retains its full Federal certification; successfully transition the maintenance and support contract from Covansys to Deloitte Consulting with minimal downtime; maintain all 92 County IV-D data on the ISETS system; implement enhanced financial audit ability and tracking changes as outlined by the Indiana State Board of Accounts EDP audit of 2000; and replace IBM OfficeVision/400 software, which is obsolete and no longer supported by IBM.





Department of Child Services

The following are discretionary goals that are dependent upon funding: Enhance the employer payment Internet application to support more employers and to streamline reporting; significantly modify ISETS to take advantage to Internet and browser-based software to improve usability and to streamline operations; modify the ISETS statewide telecom network to facilitate the Courthouse Connectivity initiative of the Indiana Technology Oversight Commission; and Consolidate the 99 ISETS AS/400 computers centrally onto new hardware in order to significantly reduce maintenance and software licensing costs.


The Bureau of Child Support has cooperative agreements with 90 local county prosecutors that provide child support enforcement services in all 92 counties. Through this partnership, Indiana's children are getting more of the money they deserve. Enforcement efforts produced \$454,873,530 in distributed child support collections in state fiscal year 2004. Indiana's enforcement efforts are not only successful, but efficient as well. Indiana children receive more child support for every dollar spent on administrative costs than any other state. The April 2004 issue of Governing magazine recognized Indiana as the number one state in the nation in child support collections per dollar of administrative costs spent in federal fiscal year 2002. The national average was \$4.13. Indiana collected \$7.80 for every dollar spent in administrative costs designated to operate Indiana's Child Support Program.

Contracts

Vendor - Deloitte Consulting, L.P.



Disbursement of Child Support Collected State Fiscal Years 1991 -2004



Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Financial Management
-04/20/2005





Child Support (IV-D) Distributed Collections State Fiscal Year 2004 (July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2004)

COUNTY	TANF Total Amount	NON TANF Total Amount	State Fiscal Year	COUNTY	TANF Total Amount	NON TANF Total Amount	State Fiscal Year
Adams	126,364	2,400,260	2,526,624	Lawrence	177,436	3,074,038	3,251,474
Allen	1,996,922	25,899,122	27,896,045	Madison	1,033,650	9,651,175	10,684,824
Bartholomew	381,422	3,910,980	4,292,402	Marion	3,663,534	74,460,737	78,124,271
Benton	9,377	888,553	897,930	Marshall	144,919	4,147,495	4,292,413
Blackford	71,802	1,677,952	1,749,753	Martin	90,322	848,455	938,777
Boone	104,371	2,387,564	2,491,935	Miami	177,488	2,912,652	3,090,139
Brown	45,449	1,243,754	1,289,203	Monroe	547,391	6,137,888	6,685,279
Carroll	60,330	1,358,412	1,418,742	Montgomery	320,308	2,389,461	2,709,769
Cass	152,883	3,603,578	3,756,461	Morgan	255,959	4,548,207	4,804,166
Clark	330,961	4,852,262	5,183,223	Newton	38,124	1,200,676	1,238,800
Clay	123,445	2,149,983	2,273,428	Noble	204,399	5,945,634	6,150,033
Clinton	122,730	1,998,378	2,121,108	Ohio	14,296	307,899	322,195
Crawford	41,341	692,401	733,742	Orange	96,693	1,320,611	1,417,304
Daviess	162,057	1,901,753	2,063,810	Owen	130,780	1,522,305	1,653,085
Dearborn	96,165	2,895,795	2,991,959	Parke	31,966	828,650	860,616
Decatur	155,681	2,483,400	2,639,081	Perry	89,890	1,472,398	1,562,288
Dekalb	117,227	3,592,415	3,709,642	Pike	124,519	1,062,776	1,187,295
Delaware	1,056,253	8,596,968	9,653,221	Porter	434,483	6,418,634	6,853,117
Dubois	111,264	1,982,074	2,093,338	Posey	101,419	1,231,536	1,332,956
Elkhart	896,389	10,986,892	11,883,281	Pulaski	37,259	1,193,963	1,231,221
Fayette	217,960	2,476,137	2,694,096	Putnam	149,529	2,564,091	2,713,620
Floyd	260,331	3,373,082	3,633,413	Randolph	151,263	1,932,801	2,084,064
Fountain	61,758	1,313,986	1,375,745	Ripley	70,046	2,430,885	2,500,931
Franklin	142,830	1,653,649	1,796,480	Rush	45,715	1,844,849	1,890,564
Fulton	93,154	2,140,989	2,234,144	St Joseph	2,199,494	19,640,430	21,839,923
Gibson	206,639	2,426,112	2,632,751	Scott	136,207	1,724,596	1,860,803
Grant	601,726	6,724,183	7,325,908	Shelby	145,460	3,770,116	3,915,576
Greene	172,957	2,878,721	3,051,678	Spencer	69,538	1,315,972	1,385,510
Hamilton	186,049	4,679,567	4,865,615	Starke	184,417	2,632,798	2,817,215
Hancock	91,997	3,250,387	3,342,384	Steuben	80,004	3,128,444	3,208,448
Harrison	109,516	2,030,463	2,139,979	Sullivan	120,660	1,567,188	1,687,848
Hendricks	84,190	4,024,560	4,108,750	Switzerland	18,004	353,181	371,185
Henry	402,374	3,975,506	4,377,880	Tippecanoe	538,384	6,570,972	7,109,356
Howard	372,361	6,073,734	6,446,094	Tipton	23,413	555,372	578,785
Huntington	112,281	4,828,053	4,940,334	Union	43,451	944,439	987,890
Jackson	162,676	3,012,167	3,174,844	Vanderburgh	1,481,411	11,544,367	13,025,778
Jasper	173,431	3,043,164	3,216,595	Vermillion	61,373	1,543,931	1,605,305
Jay	85,079	1,823,082	1,908,161	Vigo	901,129	8,937,530	9,838,659
Jefferson	95,406	1,750,495	1,845,901	Wabash	181,770	3,251,087	3,432,857
Jennings	145,409	2,172,071	2,317,480	Warren	26,483	860,858	887,340
Johnson	201,210	6,338,128	6,539,338	Warrick	197,640	2,352,126	2,549,767
Knox	260,171	2,141,385	2,401,556	Washington	111,272	1,697,674	1,808,945
Kosciusko	143,204	6,088,362	6,231,565	Wayne	510,483	6,099,943	6,610,427
Lagrange	33,215	1,993,478	2,026,693	Wells	80,976	2,531,389	2,612,365
Lake	3,205,956	25,883,941	29,089,897	White	81,910	1,905,876	1,987,787
Laporte	559,254	7,587,178	8,146,432	Whitley	58,984	3,584,934	3,643,918
StateTotals**	TANF	NON TANF	Grand Total				
	29,727,415	425,146,115	454,873,530				

NOTES: *INCLUDES ADJUSTMENTS RECEIVED AT THE STATE AS TANF AND DISTRIBUTED TO THE PAYEE OR PAYOR.

**TOTALS ROUNDED. COLUMNS MAY NOT ADD TO TOTAL AMOUNT DUE TO PRIOR MONTH ADJUSTMENTS.

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Financial Mangement





Indiana Statewide Performance and Incentives Federal Fiscal Years 2000 - 2004 (October - September)

Indiana's Performance Measure Scores						2004 National Performance Measure Averages*
Performance Measure	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004*	
Order Establishment	51%	50%	70%	75%	70%	74.0%
Paternity Establishment	45%	62%	52%	72%	80%	78.0%
Current Support Collected	45%	46%	48%	50.5%	51.0%	59.0%
Cases Paying on Arrears	51%	48%	52%	55.0%	56.0%	60.0%

*2004 Results are preliminary and unaudited by the federal government

Indiana Data Reliability Scores				
Performance Measure	2000	2001	2002	2003
Order Establishment	75%	86%	96%	99%
Paternity Establishment	52%	62%	82%	97%
Current Support Collected	62%	90%	95%	99%
Cases Paying on Arrears	78%	85%	97%	98%

Federal Incentives Received by Indiana			
2000	2001	2002	2003
\$3,530,279	\$3,140,024	\$5,564,581	\$5,552,522

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
Office of Child Support Enforcement
-Federal 157 Report





Child Support County Performance Measures Federal Fiscal Year 2000 - 2004

County	Order Establishment					Paternity Establishment					Current Support ⁻¹					Cases paying on arrears ⁻²				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Adams	65%	70%	86%	86%	85%	77%	106%	76%	93%	101%	58%	64%	66%	66%	67%	74%	73%	76%	77%	75%
Allen	55%	52%	70%	77%	71%	52%	80%	77%	77%	87%	41%	44%	47%	49%	48%	48%	51%	54%	53%	54%
Bartholomew	63%	62%	73%	79%	84%	52%	95%	64%	87%	92%	52%	52%	53%	54%	56%	63%	60%	60%	62%	66%
Benton	49%	54%	70%	82%	78%	13%	25%	50%	85%	87%	50%	54%	57%	63%	66%	63%	66%	70%	72%	74%
Blackford	58%	59%	78%	83%	79%	74%	82%	68%	89%	99%	50%	54%	57%	58%	58%	66%	69%	67%	66%	70%
Boone	62%	62%	81%	80%	78%	84%	89%	78%	75%	90%	54%	57%	57%	57%	55%	68%	66%	67%	67%	64%
Brown	59%	66%	83%	87%	88%	66%	100%	75%	96%	106%	50%	57%	59%	58%	58%	66%	65%	70%	68%	67%
Carroll	56%	56%	82%	78%	76%	44%	47%	54%	88%	85%	54%	60%	58%	58%	58%	66%	70%	71%	72%	79%
Cass	52%	51%	74%	78%	79%	44%	48%	48%	66%	79%	50%	54%	54%	57%	57%	62%	62%	61%	62%	63%
Clark	41%	41%	59%	65%	61%	43%	61%	49%	56%	71%	36%	40%	42%	45%	37%	43%	47%	51%	53%	55%
Clay	68%	68%	77%	76%	71%	78%	104%	79%	83%	87%	55%	55%	57%	58%	57%	67%	64%	66%	65%	63%
Clinton	57%	50%	68%	78%	77%	73%	85%	53%	73%	85%	53%	59%	61%	63%	62%	71%	70%	70%	70%	71%
Crawford	45%	45%	66%	72%	69%	43%	57%	55%	73%	83%	49%	51%	51%	49%	45%	63%	59%	61%	60%	54%
Daviess	51%	51%	75%	76%	75%	54%	61%	54%	78%	87%	52%	55%	57%	60%	62%	56%	56%	61%	61%	63%
Dearborn	43%	42%	68%	73%	70%	22%	34%	37%	69%	74%	46%	49%	52%	53%	53%	54%	55%	58%	58%	57%
Decatur	81%	87%	93%	95%	94%	105%	120%	95%	100%	104%	62%	66%	67%	66%	67%	69%	71%	74%	72%	73%
DeKalb	64%	63%	82%	88%	87%	92%	113%	80%	95%	98%	56%	59%	61%	62%	62%	68%	70%	72%	70%	74%
Delaware	57%	57%	78%	79%	77%	66%	74%	63%	82%	90%	38%	44%	45%	46%	48%	50%	53%	54%	53%	53%
Dubois	55%	56%	77%	80%	80%	93%	113%	74%	88%	101%	61%	62%	63%	66%	67%	70%	69%	73%	72%	72%
Elkhart	49%	45%	62%	69%	66%	39%	57%	62%	64%	80%	36%	40%	43%	47%	50%	52%	53%	53%	54%	59%
Fayette	50%	56%	87%	91%	88%	56%	77%	63%	98%	105%	45%	51%	57%	60%	59%	51%	62%	67%	65%	70%
Floyd	33%	33%	57%	59%	56%	22%	52%	66%	63%	69%	48%	47%	45%	45%	46%	62%	62%	59%	56%	54%
Fountain	42%	43%	70%	75%	71%	33%	44%	42%	64%	84%	53%	58%	59%	61%	62%	63%	67%	65%	64%	64%
Franklin	59%	58%	75%	78%	77%	78%	89%	83%	79%	93%	54%	55%	57%	58%	57%	62%	63%	66%	62%	65%
Fulton	55%	53%	79%	81%	78%	44%	75%	50%	78%	95%	45%	51%	54%	55%	57%	58%	60%	66%	65%	67%
Gibson	65%	68%	90%	89%	91%	92%	102%	78%	103%	102%	51%	57%	59%	59%	60%	64%	63%	68%	66%	67%
Grant	59%	56%	79%	80%	76%	42%	73%	58%	75%	85%	45%	50%	53%	54%	55%	51%	55%	55%	53%	55%
Greene	64%	71%	84%	86%	84%	102%	140%	96%	93%	103%	54%	59%	61%	60%	60%	65%	66%	70%	73%	70%
Hamilton	52%	53%	73%	75%	73%	70%	77%	57%	75%	82%	41%	47%	48%	53%	56%	54%	54%	60%	61%	64%
Hancock	52%	57%	79%	83%	81%	51%	101%	77%	90%	101%	50%	55%	58%	59%	63%	63%	64%	67%	68%	68%
Harrison	49%	46%	63%	68%	65%	65%	69%	60%	60%	66%	47%	49%	50%	51%	52%	58%	62%	61%	60%	60%
Hendricks	53%	53%	78%	75%	72%	38%	72%	55%	83%	85%	53%	56%	57%	60%	60%	67%	63%	67%	72%	69%
Henry	63%	63%	79%	82%	78%	65%	87%	70%	83%	92%	48%	52%	55%	54%	54%	60%	61%	62%	59%	60%
Howard	50%	52%	71%	77%	70%	27%	39%	39%	67%	78%	38%	44%	46%	49%	48%	52%	47%	48%	48%	49%
Huntington	63%	66%	87%	89%	86%	71%	90%	77%	92%	94%	66%	68%	70%	69%	68%	77%	76%	79%	80%	78%
Jackson	47%	47%	79%	77%	74%	29%	34%	41%	84%	80%	46%	47%	51%	54%	54%	61%	63%	60%	60%	60%
Jasper	58%	66%	87%	90%	86%	73%	84%	67%	95%	108%	54%	60%	62%	65%	66%	65%	66%	71%	73%	73%
Jay	58%	57%	81%	85%	81%	40%	83%	66%	95%	92%	51%	56%	59%	62%	60%	63%	64%	65%	67%	66%
Jefferson	48%	48%	71%	77%	80%	48%	47%	55%	78%	88%	38%	44%	49%	49%	51%	50%	52%	57%	54%	56%
Jennings	43%	66%	74%	76%	79%	81%	101%	41%	84%	91%	40%	52%	60%	58%	60%	51%	56%	66%	67%	68%
Johnson	53%	58%	73%	76%	72%	42%	77%	55%	75%	87%	52%	57%	57%	58%	58%	62%	62%	62%	64%	68%
Knox	46%	46%	71%	75%	68%	55%	59%	42%	70%	80%	44%	44%	46%	49%	48%	52%	52%	53%	51%	52%
Kosciusko	64%	62%	79%	84%	80%	63%	94%	73%	81%	94%	61%	62%	63%	61%	61%	72%	72%	73%	72%	70%
Lagrange	65%	61%	75%	78%	80%	38%	90%	62%	84%	90%	53%	59%	60%	58%	56%	64%	70%	72%	69%	63%
Lake	42%	43%	63%	72%	61%	8%	71%	61%	57%	67%	27%	31%	32%	35%	35%	30%	30%	30%	32%	35%
Laporte	53%	53%	71%	73%	68%	66%	77%	60%	83%	91%	39%	44%	46%	49%	50%	50%	49%	53%	53%	56%
Lawrence	50%	49%	75%	81%	78%	37%	54%	49%	76%	82%	42%	47%	51%	54%	54%	53%	59%	60%	60%	60%
Madison	60%	58%	76%	78%	72%	64%	77%	63%	78%	86%	46%	49%	52%	52%	54%	59%	61%	63%	59%	61%

Prepared by:
Office of Data Management
6/21/2005

Source:
Office of Child Support Enforcement





Child Support County Performance Measures Federal Fiscal Year 2000 - 2004

County	Order Establishment					Paternity Establishment					Current Support ¹					Cases paying on arrears ²				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Marion	52%	48%	62%	67%	62%	40%	85%	67%	63%	74%	43%	46%	46%	49%	49%	42%	38%	41%	52%	52%
Marshall	62%	61%	82%	84%	85%	69%	78%	81%	95%	96%	51%	54%	58%	60%	61%	59%	62%	65%	67%	69%
Martin	48%	51%	81%	82%	78%	68%	87%	64%	97%	92%	54%	57%	61%	60%	63%	68%	69%	69%	67%	67%
Miami	53%	52%	77%	82%	78%	46%	59%	61%	85%	90%	48%	55%	58%	58%	56%	60%	63%	65%	62%	62%
Monroe	52%	54%	78%	79%	79%	65%	83%	74%	92%	95%	46%	49%	51%	52%	54%	59%	59%	59%	60%	61%
Montgomery	55%	60%	83%	84%	80%	54%	79%	66%	98%	98%	48%	52%	52%	54%	56%	66%	64%	66%	64%	67%
Morgan	50%	50%	73%	75%	68%	39%	62%	47%	72%	82%	50%	53%	54%	56%	56%	62%	62%	65%	63%	65%
Newton	47%	43%	57%	69%	76%	37%	64%	44%	44%	85%	45%	51%	52%	62%	63%	57%	63%	68%	68%	70%
Noble	76%	76%	83%	85%	84%	92%	103%	85%	84%	94%	65%	61%	66%	67%	66%	76%	75%	77%	77%	75%
Ohio	39%	40%	65%	66%	66%	33%	37%	32%	66%	77%	32%	40%	47%	51%	47%	43%	53%	57%	58%	57%
Orange	52%	50%	81%	79%	75%	53%	58%	41%	127%	100%	43%	51%	53%	55%	51%	58%	60%	60%	62%	62%
Owen	47%	46%	73%	76%	74%	53%	66%	53%	82%	102%	45%	50%	51%	52%	54%	63%	65%	66%	66%	64%
Parke	47%	45%	75%	77%	75%	33%	107%	71%	79%	83%	42%	41%	45%	47%	50%	59%	56%	60%	59%	60%
Perry	48%	49%	73%	77%	74%	29%	58%	57%	83%	98%	55%	55%	60%	62%	65%	61%	66%	67%	66%	72%
Pike	53%	52%	77%	81%	80%	54%	74%	60%	91%	104%	43%	51%	55%	61%	66%	54%	60%	61%	63%	65%
Porter	55%	58%	69%	75%	70%	40%	67%	73%	77%	87%	40%	44%	46%	46%	48%	50%	53%	54%	52%	52%
Posey	57%	55%	72%	78%	73%	92%	96%	69%	74%	86%	52%	56%	57%	55%	56%	62%	62%	66%	60%	59%
Pulaski	51%	58%	77%	80%	76%	45%	51%	50%	81%	91%	47%	52%	58%	61%	64%	58%	57%	64%	68%	72%
Putnam	69%	80%	85%	86%	85%	72%	116%	97%	99%	101%	55%	57%	57%	58%	59%	66%	65%	68%	66%	69%
Randolph	45%	52%	80%	87%	85%	16%	46%	55%	101%	95%	44%	50%	59%	64%	63%	58%	60%	65%	72%	73%
Ripley	65%	59%	76%	80%	80%	39%	81%	87%	84%	90%	55%	60%	61%	62%	63%	72%	72%	71%	70%	71%
Rush	57%	61%	83%	84%	81%	82%	105%	70%	92%	91%	52%	58%	64%	66%	67%	62%	67%	74%	75%	76%
St Joe	57%	57%	78%	79%	76%	61%	67%	61%	77%	81%	35%	40%	43%	45%	46%	52%	54%	54%	53%	53%
Scott	49%	51%	68%	74%	74%	55%	48%	57%	89%	89%	45%	46%	46%	49%	50%	50%	49%	49%	48%	50%
Shelby	59%	58%	76%	78%	78%	55%	99%	73%	86%	96%	55%	60%	61%	62%	63%	71%	71%	75%	75%	74%
Spencer	45%	46%	73%	77%	75%	48%	60%	50%	85%	98%	43%	48%	57%	60%	60%	59%	61%	64%	65%	66%
Starke	53%	54%	79%	82%	78%	57%	71%	56%	82%	93%	45%	50%	53%	55%	57%	60%	59%	69%	69%	71%
Steuben	74%	72%	75%	77%	74%	65%	113%	92%	84%	82%	66%	67%	65%	62%	61%	79%	77%	76%	70%	72%
Sullivan	47%	51%	77%	77%	76%	49%	55%	52%	90%	95%	53%	57%	57%	56%	57%	69%	66%	67%	65%	66%
Switzerland	34%	35%	61%	68%	70%	33%	35%	31%	59%	88%	36%	42%	42%	44%	43%	44%	49%	51%	46%	51%
Tippecanoe	42%	38%	62%	67%	61%	44%	53%	39%	65%	76%	49%	51%	53%	55%	54%	62%	57%	59%	63%	63%
Tipton	54%	50%	62%	62%	58%	95%	117%	66%	57%	79%	71%	71%	66%	68%	66%	80%	77%	73%	67%	71%
Union	73%	73%	86%	84%	79%	115%	127%	90%	91%	91%	61%	67%	67%	63%	62%	75%	78%	76%	72%	70%
Vanderburgh	55%	57%	77%	80%	77%	43%	64%	62%	75%	83%	31%	35%	37%	39%	41%	41%	40%	42%	41%	42%
Vermillion	70%	74%	86%	85%	83%	90%	120%	122%	106%	97%	59%	61%	61%	61%	63%	61%	64%	69%	63%	67%
Vigo	56%	56%	75%	77%	75%	57%	84%	75%	86%	92%	43%	45%	47%	49%	49%	55%	55%	58%	56%	55%
Wabash	69%	81%	89%	91%	90%	110%	122%	87%	107%	106%	62%	66%	66%	68%	67%	69%	70%	74%	72%	72%
Warren	52%	51%	88%	94%	93%	41%	83%	62%	95%	117%	55%	66%	70%	75%	72%	62%	71%	75%	81%	79%
Warrick	54%	54%	81%	84%	81%	52%	74%	53%	92%	94%	35%	42%	45%	50%	53%	47%	54%	59%	57%	58%
Washington	48%	47%	73%	77%	74%	34%	40%	45%	84%	71%	35%	43%	47%	52%	54%	51%	55%	55%	61%	61%
Wayne	51%	52%	74%	79%	83%	57%	71%	56%	78%	89%	44%	49%	49%	51%	52%	56%	59%	60%	57%	60%
Wells	61%	60%	80%	83%	80%	55%	61%	61%	78%	87%	61%	62%	62%	64%	63%	70%	67%	70%	70%	73%
White	47%	44%	70%	76%	74%	31%	36%	51%	78%	84%	54%	57%	57%	60%	60%	67%	66%	67%	68%	68%
Whitley	71%	77%	85%	84%	85%	78%	94%	70%	88%	94%	68%	72%	75%	74%	73%	76%	76%	79%	80%	77%
Statewide	51%	50%	70%	75%	70%	45%	62%	52%	72%	80%	45%	46%	48%	51%	51%	51%	48%	52%	55%	56%

1- The current support measurement looks at the amount of support paid versus the amount of support due. It is not the percent of parents paying - it is the percent of the amount due that is collected.

2- Cases paying on arrears looks at the number of cases with at least one payment on the arrears versus the number of cases where an arrears owed. It again, it is not a percent of parents paying since the same obligor could have multiple cases.

It is possible for the same case to be included in both categories; or a case may only be in one - depending upon what was paid on their case.


Prepared by:
Office of Data Management
6/21/2005

Source:
Office of Child Support Enforcement





Child Support Performance Measures Order Established




Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
OCSE Report
-September 2004



Child Support Performance Measures Paternity Establishment




Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
OCSE Report
-September 2004



Child Support Performance Measures Cases Paying on Arrears



Prepared by:
Office of Data Management

Source:
OCSE Report
-September 2004

